THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXVIII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1939 NUMBER 1274

Chamberlain Says Please

As Europe waited for Hitler's reply to President Roosevelt, a good deal of obscure maneuvering went on. Nevile Henderson, British Ambassador to Berlin, returned to his post. This was like a trickle of ice water down the necks of those in Britain and elsewhere who hoped that at last Chamberlain could be trusted to try no more appeasement. But in Chamberlain's defense it was rumored that he would warn Hitler to be moderate, on penalty of the introduction of conscription in Britain. At the same time the Marquis of Lothian was chosen as new Ambassador to the United States. Lord Lothian in the past has been a prime appeaser. On the other hand, he would be better fitted than any other man in England to engage our sympathy and support if Britain went to war. He knows this country well and has many friends here.

Meanwhile the proposed military understanding with the Soviet Union hung fire. She was reported to require as a condition of her aid, not merely firm collective security in Europe, but help in case of attack by Japan. No small nation except Rumania was definitely brought into the Grand Alliance. Yugoslavia, which Chamberlain conspicuously omitted to guarantee, was brought closer to the Rome-Berlin Axis through conversations with Italian statesmen. The idea of introducing conscription in Britain may still be dropped, if the labor unions oppose it strongly—as they have good reason to do. As yet nobody knows how serious and determined is the opposition which further aggression would have to face—but it can do no harm to be skeptical.

Who's Afraid of the B.B. Wolf?

Mussolini and Hitler are doing their best to pour ridicule on President Roosevelt's request that they say whether they intend more conquest or not. Obviously they do not want to say, and regard him as a meany for suggesting it. Mussolini innocently wonders why people should think Italy expects a war when she is preparing a big world's fair. He simply can't believe that his former words and actions have given anyone cause for apprehension. Italy is of course a great guardian of peace—on her own terms. And he twits the President on "pyramidal errors of geography"—whatever that may mean. Hitler's emissaries have meanwhile been rushing around to foreign offices, feverishly asking the little states mentioned in Roosevelt's telegram whether they knew he was going to intercede for them and whether they are afraid of German aggression. Apparently he intends to make a big point of the expected replies, which will indicate that the President has been butting in needlessly. But nobody outside Germany will be deceived by statements of nations that have watched the fate of Austria and Czecho-Slovakia and think it wise to be tactful when facing a loaded gun.

The German Air Bogey

What is the strength of the German air force? At the time of Munich, The New Republic questioned the

CONTENTS

The Week 361

Editorials
- Hard Facts About Neutrality 364
- To Make Employers Fight Fair 365
- Teachers' Manifesto 366

General Articles
- The Obsolescence of Federalism . . . . . Harold J. Laski 367
- Georges Bonnet and His Foreign Policy . . . . . Gallicus 370
- Marxist Humanism . . . Edmund Wilson 371
- Elegy for Ataturk . . . Marguerite Arnold 373
- Sheepbells in Autumn (verse) . . . . . Conrad Pendleton 375
- Shoot the Works . . . . Heywood Broun 375
- Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 376
- Other People's Money . . . John T. Flynn 377
- April Openings . . . . . Otis Ferguson 378
- The Bandwagon 379

Correspondence 380

Books in Review
- American Tragedy . . . Malcolm Cowley 382
- Mr. Bingham's Program . John Chamberlain 383
- Original Sin . . . . . Louis MacNeice 384
- When the Bombs Came . . . Norah Hoult 386
- After Newton . . . . . David Ramsey 386
- New Books: A Reader's List 387

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1939, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 40TH ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.

astronomical figures that were being quoted—such as 10,000 or 12,000 planes ready for battle. Exaggeration of German air power is of no use to anyone except to Hitler in his attempt to frighten opponents into concessions, and to plane manufacturers. Now comes The Economist of London—a solid periodical which is extremely careful of its facts—with a new study of the subject. In its issue of April 15, 1939, it repeats the subsequent German admission that last September the first-line force was 3,000 planes—a figure confirmed by other sources. The British first-line strength at the time was about two-thirds as large. Since then the British have maintained at least the same ratio in new manufacture, and they have probably improved their position. "The rate of increase is almost certainly greater in Great Britain than in Germany."

Colonel Lindbergh is reported to have said that German bombers and fighters are faster than ours. The Economist does not agree, at least concerning service speeds—though extraordinarily high speeds have been claimed in calculations and limited experiments. "The performance of the British machines, type for type, is superior to that of the German." The superiority is more marked in fighters than in bombers—but the German bombers have a much more limited range.

The greatest weakness of the German air force is in fuel supply. Germany produces only 1,200,000 tons at present; peacetime requirements in 1940 are estimated at 6,300,000 tons, and wartime requirements at 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 tons.

Spanish Aftermath

Originally set for May 1, General Franco's victory parade in Madrid has been twice postponed, first to May 15 and then to May 30. Now we hear from Burgos that official invitations have been sent out, and that it will be May 15 after all. Stories about the reasons why Franco has behaved in this undignified way are beginning to get around. One of them is that the Carlists, who strongly dislike both the Germans and the Italians, and are furious at the prospect of continuance of foreign power in Spain, are insisting on a prominent place in the parade. General Yagüe, who was the most prominent figure in a former Falangist opposition group, is believed to side with the Carlists. That makes a plausible reason for Franco's dispatch of large forces of Moors, perhaps 60,000 of them, back to Spanish Morocco, for Yagüe commands the Moroccan Army Corps.

Another explanation for the postponement of the review is that the Axis wants to keep the Italian troops in Spain and is using this as the best excuse. But of course the longer the Italians stay, the more angry the Carlists become. Although there have been vague reports that some of the Italians were leaving Spain, accounts of their arrival in Italy are fewer and even

Fifteenth Army Corps, including artillery, is stationed at Gerona, fifteen miles from the French border, and that 800 Navarrese with several tanks are garrisoning Port Bou on the border itself. Franco is, at the same time, demobilizing some 200,000 troops. But they will hardly feel they are out of the army, since the government has issued a decree permitting it to order the "temporary compulsory mobilization of the whole of Spanish youth for the historic task of reconstruction of national wealth." We wonder how the young Carlists will like rebuilding Spain for the Germans and Italians.

Benes Speaks Out

When Hitler seized Czecho-Slovakia, he freed one man, its former president. Dr. Edward Benes had, up till then, felt himself in honor bound to do nothing that might impede the working of the Munich agreement. Now, however, he has accepted formal leadership of the Czechs and Slovaks in foreign countries, chiefly America, who are working to liberate their homeland. Representatives from the federation that includes all Czech and Slovak organizations in this country, who are preparing the groundwork for a Czechoslovak National Council to represent all their compatriots in the democratic nations, asked Dr. Benes to lead their movement. He accepted, saying, "I have not stopped working for our country since I left it in October of last year after Munich."

He has also been freed to speak of the Munich crisis, notably in the interview he gave to Erika Mann, as published in The Chicago Daily News. It clears up two historical points that were much in dispute. Miss Mann asked if the Soviet Union had been ready to give aid to Czecho-Slovakia, and if her military preparedness had been sufficient to make that aid effective. She reports Dr. Benes to have said: "Russia was faithful to the very last moment; I know that. Shortly before the Munich conference I sent a military commission to Russia. It came back with the best reports as to all aspects of Russia's morale and military preparedness. The reports as to air, sea and land forces were completely satisfactory." He added that he was assured by Russia that she would have sent military assistance even though France and Great Britain failed to do so. Dr. Benes speaks with full authority on this subject; he was in a position to know, and his accuracy and honesty are unquestionable.

Bribed by Moscow Gold?

A number of Congressmen, according to reports from Washington, are afraid that the WPA workers will overthrow the government of the United States. They tremble at their discovery that the Workers' Alliance—the union of WPA employees—has a few Communist officers. Maybe the fear is worth serious

LICENSED TO UNT.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Congressmen in question. One would think that, in order to retain the loyalty of the unemployed for the government, they would try to make sure that they could earn their livings under decent working conditions. But the Congressmen seem to be pursuing just the opposite course. They cut the funds for relief, advocate the discharge of all relief workers suspected of being Communists, and object to the policy of the WPA administrators in hearing and adjusting complaints brought before them by the Workers' Alliance. Thus they are doing their best to prove that the Communist leaders are more sincerely interested in the welfare of the unemployed than they are. The Dies committee ought to investigate this transparent provocation. Obviously there are secret agents of the Third International posing as conservative Congressmen.

The WPA in Congress

President Roosevelt has no respect for our deadline. As this issue was being printed he presented Congress with three executive orders consolidating (by the power granted him in the Reorganization Act) about twelve government offices into three independent agencies—one for public works, one for public lending and one for welfare activities. Mr. Roosevelt's action complicates the battle over relief momentarily, although it may have the final result of straightening out the mess.

So far, too much of the say about the fate of the WPA has been entrusted to Senator Byrnes of South Carolina. He has shown every intention of improving the "jobs for all" policy by doing away with it. As Samuel Grafton pointed out in our issue of March 22, Senator Byrnes has tried to kill work relief by replacing it with a thinly disguised dole. He has tried to end the WPA educational, recreational and arts projects by quiet omission, hoping apparently that nobody would notice. The President's relief proposals are certainly an improvement over this, and we hope that Congress can forget the next election long enough to discuss them intelligently. Already they have produced one praiseworthy effect, by causing Senator Byrnes to withdraw his bill.

Memo to Senator Byrnes

The La Follette Civil Liberties Committee has done more to preserve the American way of life than any other committee set up by the last five Congresses. Once more there is hope that its work may be continued. By a bill lately introduced in the Senate, it would receive an appropriation of $100,000—an amount that would enable it to finish the much needed investigation of the Associated Farmers, as well as other important projects. We hear that if the bill gets out on the floor of the Senate, it will have comparatively clear sailing. At the moment it is being considered by the Senate Audit Committee, of which Senator three other members of the Audit Committee, Senator Byrnes has a most important voice in its decisions. In the midst of his attempts to abolish the WPA white-collar projects, the gentleman from South Carolina has spoken often and loudly in behalf of the American way. Here is a wonderful chance for him to prove that he knew what he was talking about.

Another Attack on Parking

Detroit has undertaken a startling attack on the automobile-parking problem. The city is purchasing parking lots on the outskirts of the business area and will provide free transportation by bus from these lots to the downtown district. A fee will be charged for parking, but it will only be large enough to cover the cost of operation. Your parking ticket is also your bus ticket, entitling you to a round trip. Sooner or later every American municipality will discover that the streets belong to the community as a whole and should not have their usefulness destroyed by a minority of selfish automobile owners.

News Notes of a Week

Lieutenant-Colonel German Busch, president of Bolivia, established a new totalitarian state in the Western hemisphere when he issued a decree dissolving Congress, suspending the constitution, all laws and all constitutional rights and establishing a political and financial dictatorship. . . . Richard Mowrer, the Rome correspondent of The Chicago Daily News, was asked to leave Italy by May 5. He was charged with "sending false and arbitrary news," but the authorities have so far refused to specify the dispatches to which they object. . . . Seventy-one Americans of the International Brigades who had been captured and held as prisoners by Franco were freed, leaving ten more behind. The Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade reported that it was possible these boys and others now in Le Havre waiting to return to America might be jailed in France because the Friends have no funds to maintain them until their passports and passage can be obtained.

Leon Henderson was nominated by President Roosevelt to the vacancy on the Securities and Exchange Commission. His term will expire June 5, but it is expected that he will be named then for the full five years. This makes Jerome Frank the heavy favorite for SEC chairman, on which the commissioners are expected to vote when Mr. Henderson's appointment has been confirmed. . . . Billy Rose was having labor trouble with his World's Fair Aquacade troupe. The American Federation of Actors were insisting on union wages, even though some of the troupe had signed individual contracts after a moving plea by Mr. Rose. He asked them if they realized what it meant to be made glamorous, to swim in purple water and to earn

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hard Facts About Neutrality

In discussions of revising the Neutrality Act, it is probable that nine persons out of ten do not know what the act specifies, why its provisions were adopted or what its effect would be. They assume that it will avoid throwing the influence of the United States on either side in a war, or may even cause us to help the "aggressors." The opponents of the act are largely responsible for these errors; scarcely any recent public discussion has been carried on at a lower plane in lack of realistic understanding or disregard of the facts. We therefore venture a little catechism covering some of the more important points.

1. In what way would application of the Neutrality Act favor Britain and France in case of war?

These nations could, without objection from us, use their sea power to blockade their enemies or to confiscate or destroy cargoes of contraband. We should thus avoid nearly the whole controversy about "neutral rights" and "freedom of the seas" that embroiled us with Great Britain in the last war, up to the very moment when we decided to enter it against Germany. This consequence arises from the probable application of the cash-and-carry provisions and from the prohibition against travel on belligerent ships by American citizens.

2. Would the same provisions also safeguard us against being compelled to go to war against Britain's enemies?

Yes. In case Germany or Italy unleashed "unrestricted submarine warfare," the chances of their injuring American citizens, ships or cargoes consigned to Britain or France would be substantially reduced. This was the precise occasion of our entering the last war.

3. Would our economic aid be denied to Britain and France under this act?

No, on the contrary, they would derive almost exclusive benefit from it. We have, under Question 1, showed how it would allow them to police ocean trade. But also, under the cash-and-carry plan, they would have plenty of cash purchasing power in this country to buy needed goods, plus merchant ships to take them away, while Italy, Germany and other nations on their side have neither cash nor command of the seas.

4. Does the Neutrality Act embargo all trade to belligerents?

No. It requires an embargo merely on "arms, ammunition and implements of war." In the last war Britain and France manufactured by far the greater part of their own munitions, and their orders of munitions here were only a small percentage of their total war imports from us.

5. Did the Neutrality Act fail in the war between Japan and China? Did it compel us to aid the aggressor?

No. It was never invoked by the President, because war was never declared. Our economic aid to Japan—and it has been substantial, because she could not have continued to make war without buying petroleum products and scrap steel from us—would have been diminished by application of the act. It would have created more difficulty for her in buying these products, with her limited cash purchasing power and merchant marine. This would almost surely have overbalanced the inability of China to buy munitions from us under the law. Of course we would not have sold planes to Japan either. If Japan had felt China would suffer more than she from the act, she would probably have declared war on China.

6. If the act would thus favor the "western democracies" in a European war, why do its provisions help us to maintain neutrality?

Neutrality and objective impartiality are quite different things. Neutrality means merely that all belligerents are treated alike under the law. It does not mean that they benefit equally under that treatment. There is no conceivable law, or lack of law, under which Britain and France would not derive more economic support from us than Germany in a war, unless we actually fought against the western nations. That is because of their preponderant sea power, merchant marine and financial resources. The essence of neutrality in this act is that it was adopted long in advance of the outbreak of war, without reference to any particular belligerent, and that it applies equally to all.

7. Why is it desirable to take some action about the law now?

Because the cash-and-carry provisions expire automatically on May 1. If they are not renewed, we shall be in the same position as at the start of the former European war, except in regard to munitions proper.

8. What is the significance of Senator Pittman's proposed amendments?

Principally they would abolish the absolute embargo on munitions, and extend the cash-and-carry provisions to cover them. This would permit Britain and France to import the war planes they have ordered here, and to order more. They are not likely to rely much on us for any other type of munitions. This amendment would leave us far less open to embroilment than repeal of the act would. But The New Republic is in favor of withholding this aid as a trading point, in the hope of bringing some pressure on the British and French governments concerning their foreign policies and war aims, in so far as these concern us.

9. What is the significance of the proposed Thomas amendment?

This would abandon the idea of neutrality entirely, because it would authorize the President to impose embargoes against some belligerents but not against others. He would impose them only against those

LICENSED BY LEXNEXUS
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The practical effect of the Thomas amendment, as far as economic aid goes, would be substantially the same as that of the Pittman proposal. Under the act as it stands—if amended to allow export of munitions—France, Britain and their allies could import from us anything they wanted and prevent their enemies from getting anything. It is unnecessary for the United States to impose one-sided embargoes in order to bring about that result. But the political effect of the Thomas amendment would be to proclaim our favoritism officially, and to allow American-owned munitions and contraband to be carried to our favorites on American ships, so that almost inevitably we should be forced into taking part in the hostilities.

10. Does not the Neutrality Act make it impossible for us to go to war?

Not at all. If we really want to fight, we can join a war at any time. What it does do is to diminish the economic and political occasions that might tend to drag us into war against our will. The New Republic believes it is better to keep these safeguards, allowing the American people to decide about war on the basis of major issues, rather than to establish a situation that will edge us toward war without our realizing it.

11. The argument of those behind the Thomas and similar proposals is that they may prevent the outbreak of war by showing clearly in advance on what side we should stand. What about that?

As explained above, there is already no doubt about where our economic support will go, without abandoning neutrality. Hitler and Mussolini know this, and have reckoned with it. If what we want is real collective security, then we shall have to go much further than the Thomas amendment. We shall have to make explicit alliances with the enemies of Hitler and Mussolini, pledging ourselves to fight. But only 16 percent of the American people are ready to send soldiers to Europe again.

To Make Employers Fight Fair

THE LA FOLLETTE COMMITTEE has borne some useful fruit. The two and one-half years of investigation of violations of civil liberties in industrial disputes, in the course of which 18,000,000 words of testimony were taken, have been followed by a proposal for legislation. Senators La Follette and Thomas have jointly introduced a bill entitled "The Oppressive Labor Practices Act of 1939."

The legislation follows in general the outlines predicted in The New Republic ("To Save Strikers' Blood," in our issue of April 12). It prohibits the use of labor spies, an evil that has been notorious ever since it was first revealed to the public by Sidney Howard in the pages of this paper many years ago. The bill next forbids the [illegible] petition with those whose level of conduct is higher.

industrial plants are prohibited except in such quantities as are actually required to protect goods in transit. Finally, the bill would eliminate "industrial munitions"—machine guns, sawed-off shotguns and long-range tear-gas and sickening-gas missiles. The authors state that there is no provision which interferes in any way with legitimate practices of the employer or endangers his property.

The bill has in it teeth of several varieties. Persons found guilty of violating its provisions would be subject to a fine up to $10,000 or imprisonment up to six months. They would further be forbidden the use of the United States mails in carrying on their business, and prohibited from transporting their goods, manufactured in contravention of the law, from one state to another. The bill also amends the Walsh-Healy Act, so that all firms engaged in selling goods to the United States government must certify that they will not, during the life of such contracts, engage in any labor practices such as are forbidden by this measure.

The bill would set up no new bureaus or agencies of any kind. Criminal action would be in the hands of the Department of Justice. It would also be possible, however, to obtain relief against violations through the use of injunctions obtained by the Secretary of Labor, who would have the power of preliminary inquiry.

Senators La Follette and Thomas comment truly that this bill is several decades overdue. Enlightened business men from other countries—England in particular—have for generations looked with bewilderment and horror on the American practices of breaking up trade unions by spies and *agents provocateurs*, and of using clubs, tear gas and guns against strikers. Even since the committee began its work two and a half years ago, and chiefly because of the shocking revelations it has made, public opinion has probably changed somewhat for the better. A committee report speaks of the fact that no witness appearing before it attempted any reasoned justification of the brutal practices of industrial warfare, although scores of them were asked to do so. In fact, many of them gave evidence of being heartily ashamed of what they were doing. In case after case, officials of great corporations stated that some of the worst practices had recently been discontinued, or that after buying tear gas they had decided not to use it, and so on. Thus the committee has been worth to the country far more than it cost. (Incidentally, it has probably cost nothing. The committee stumbled upon income-tax evasions which have returned, and will return, to the Treasury far more than the modest sum it cost.)

While some employers are getting a little more civilized, it would be folly to assume that the new law is not needed. There are still plenty of factory and mill owners living in the dark ages, and offering unfair com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sense to say that Congress has more important things to do at this session. Congress has no other tasks so urgent that it cannot take time to end these crying injustices to American labor.

Teachers' Manifesto

THERE IS a multitude of evidence to the fact that teachers, as a professional group, are realizing what the world is about. Last week 2,391 American educators and journalists signed a manifesto which testifies to their political awareness:

The present grave threat to world democracy places a heavy responsibility on those of us who are entrusted with the education of the youth of our country and with the channels through which knowledge and truth are disseminated to the American people. The forces which would replace democracy by fascist dictatorship are powerful and unscrupulous. In order to destroy our American tradition of tolerance and mutual coöperation they are attempting to divide our people by propaganda inciting to racial and religious persecution. We cannot remain passive in this situation. We must be true to our democratic American ideals. Democracy can be maintained and extended only by conscious activity on our part.

Fascism openly despises and, of necessity, suppresses the truth. It ruthlessly regiments school, press, radio and movies. It burns books and works of art. It ridicules and denies the principle of equal educational opportunity for all. It forces women into labor camps. It wipes out the great tradition of western humanism and replaces humanistic education with race hatred and religious intolerance. It glorifies war as the highest human good.

What is our responsibility? We must recognize the threat to democracy inherent in demands for retrenchment in education, in attacks on the Bill of Rights, in gag laws, in censorship of teachers and journalists, in racial and religious intolerance, in those newspapers which make profit or power their chief goal.

We pledge our support to those measures which will help to strengthen and preserve our democracy.

1. If we are really to be "one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all," our schools must provide liberty and justice for all, without discrimination on account of poverty, sex, race or religion.

2. Our teachers must be trained with fullest consciousness of their responsibilities; they must be devoted to the principles of democracy and intellectual freedom and they must be free to inculcate their enthusiasm in the minds of the young.

3. Our children and our adults must receive full moral and material assistance in their pursuit of knowledge.

4. Our basic civil liberties of speech, press, assembly and teaching must be protected.

5. Our schools, press and radio must present the facts, and the truth behind the facts, about our history and traditions, about the world in which we live, about race and culture, without fear or malice, without suppression or

We stand squarely behind democracy as the essential requirement for further human progress. We have full confidence in the American people. If they have the enlightenment which can be developed only in free schools by free teachers, and by an untrammeled press, they will do their part to preserve and extend our democratic heritage. Our role is to fulfill our true function as educators and journalists in a democratic society by keeping free these channels of knowledge so that the people can examine the facts with the critical spirit necessary for an intelligent appraisal and choice.

As far as it goes, this credo in democracy is obviously good. It is our Constitution, or part of it, with the added attraction of a "truthful" press, radio and classroom. It would be shocking indeed if there were any fewer than 2,391 American educators and journalists who are willing to go on record in favor of liberty, justice, democracy, intellectual freedom and truth. Actually, however, it took some courage to sign the manifesto. "Manifesto" as a word smacks of communism; favoring our constitutional rights and privileges these days is suspect. Each of these men knows his job would be more secure if he refrained from signing such appeals.

It is a sad day when it is news that a sizable group of leading intellectuals comes out in favor of the basic tenets of the United States. But we may be sure that many of the two thousand-odd meant more by their signatures than their manifesto makes explicit. Clarion calls of this sort must represent the mildest common denominators of the signing group.

Perhaps a majority of the educators and publicists realize that their statement, taken at its face value, means next to nothing; that we cannot save democracy by words alone. It requires the drudgery of organization and patient attention to thousands of details. "Standing squarely" is not enough. The educators and publicists have got to start moving.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

Editors

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

Assistant Editors: OTIS FERGUSON ELIZABETH HULING

Contributing Editors

JAMES BENÉT BRUCE BLIVEN JR. H. N. BRAILSFORD
HEYWOOD BROUN JOHN T. FLYNN WALDO FRANK
E. C. LINDEMAN JON. MITCHELL LEWIS MUMFORD
REXFORD G. TUGWELL

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

E. G. WOOD, *Advertising Manager* BYRON DEXTER, *Circulation Manager*

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Obsolescence of Federalism

No one can travel the length and breadth of the United States without the conviction of its inexpugnable variety. East and West, South and North, its regions are real and different, and each has problems real and different too. The temptation is profound to insist that here, if ever, is the classic place for a federal experiment. Union without unity—except in the Soviet Union and China, has variety ever so fully invited the implications of the famous definition? Geography, climate, culture, all of them seem to have joined their forces to insist that, wherever centralization is appropriate, here, at least, it has no meaning. Tradition demands its absence; history has prohibited its coming. The large unit, as in Lamennais' phrase, would result in apoplexy at the center and anemia at the extremities. Imposed solutions from a distant Washington, blind, as it must be blind, to the subtle minutiæ of local realities, cannot solve the ultimate problems that are in dispute. A creative America must be a federal America. The wider the powers exercised from Washington, the more ineffective will be the capacity for creative administration. Regional wisdom is the clue to the American future. The power to govern must go where that regional wisdom resides. So restrained, men learn by the exercise of responsibility the art of progress. They convince themselves by experiment from below. To fasten a uniformity that is not in nature upon an America destined to variety is to destroy the prospect of an ultimate salvation.

This kind of argument is familiar in a hundred forms. I believe that, more than any other philosophic pattern, it is responsible for the malaise of American democracy. My plea here is for the recognition that the federal form of state is unsuitable to the stage of economic and social development that America has reached. I infer from this postulate two conclusions: first, that the present division of powers, however liberal be the Supreme Court in its technique of interpretation, is inadequate to the needs America confronts; and, second, that any revision of those powers is one which must place in Washington, and Washington only, the power to amend that revision as circumstances change. I infer, in a word, that the epoch of federalism is over, and that only a decentralized system can affectively confront the problems of a new time.

To continue with the old pattern, in the age of giant capitalism, is to strike into impotence that volume of governmental power which is necessary to deal with the issues giant capitalism has raised. Federalism, I suggest, is the appropriate governmental technique for an expanding capitalism, in which the price of local of labor, the level of taxation, the stand[illegible] pensation in the total outcome. But a contracting capitalism cannot afford the luxury of federalism. It is insufficiently positive in character; it does not provide for sufficient rapidity of action; it inhibits the emergence of necessary standards of uniformity; it relies upon compacts and compromises which take insufficient account of the urgent category of time; it leaves the backward areas a restraint, at once parasitic and poisonous, on those which seek to move forward; not least, its psychological results, especially in an age of crisis, are depressing to a democracy that needs the drama of positive achievement to retain its faith.

Before I turn to the case for this view, it is worth while to dwell for a moment upon the lessons of non-American experience. It is not, I think, accident that the heavy weather encountered by the federal system in the United States has been experienced also by the three major experiments elsewhere—by Germany, by Canada and by Australia. In the first, significantly, both federalism and democracy have gone. In the others the need for constitutional revision, the sense that the historic division of powers hampers the need for social and economic reconstruction at every turn, is one of the major themes of debate. Commissions seek to discover desirable terms of effective revision in both of them. Their literature speaks of "breakdown" and "collapse." In each, also, the federal government lacks, by its bondage to a past shaped in the faith of unlimited expansion, the power effectively to cope with its outstanding problems. In each, too, the older political parties are geared psychologically to that past; and their inability to escape from the framework in which it has imprisoned them, leads to the emergence of new political orientations which threaten alike their unity and their democratic foundation. Proportionately, I suspect, their problems are less susceptible of direct solution than those of the United States. But it is, I think, an expression, not of local circumstance, but of world-historical causes, which has made federalism everywhere in the world today a handicap and not a help to governmental progress.

Giant capitalism has, in effect, concentrated the control of economic power in a small proportion of the American people. It has built a growing contrast between the distribution of that economic power and the capacity of the political democracy effectively to control the results of its exercise. It has transcended the political boundaries of the units in the American federation so as to make them largely ineffective as areas of independent government. Whether we take the conditions

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

housing and recreation, it has become clear that the true source of decision is no longer at the circumference, but at the center, of the state. For forty-eight separate units to seek to compete with the integrated power of giant capitalism is to invite defeat in every element of social life where approximate uniformity of condition is the test of the good life.

The poor state is parasitic on the body politic. It offers privileges to giant capitalism to obtain its taxable capacity, offers escape from the impositions of rich states, in order to wrest from the wealthy some poor meed of compensation for its backwardness. It dare not risk offending the great industrial empires—cotton, coal, iron and steel, tobacco—lest it lose the benefits of their patronage. Their vested interests thus begin to define the limits within which the units of the federation may venture to move. And since the division of powers limits, in its turn, the authority of the federal government to intervene—the latter being a government of limited powers—it follows that the great industrial empires can, in fact, prevent the legislation necessary to implement the purposes of a democratic society. The situation may, briefly, be summarized by saying that the Constitution inhibits the federal government from exercising the authority inherent in the idea of a democracy; while the risk to a state government of attack upon the conditions exacted by those industrial empires for their patronage is too great to permit the states to jeopardize what they have by issuing challenge. Whether, therefore, it be the hours of labor, the standards of health and housing, the effective organization of the trade unions, at every point the formal powers of the states are rarely commensurate with the actual authority they may venture to exercise. And it is the common citizen of the United States who pays the price of that margin between formal and effective power.

Political systems live by the results they can obtain for the great mass of their citizens. A democracy is not likely to survive on formal grounds merely; it will survive as it is able to convince its citizens that it adequately protects their powers to satisfy the expectations they deem their experience to warrant. In the present phase of American capitalist democracy, the central government largely lacks the power to implement the ends it is essential it should serve if its democratic context is to be maintained. It cannot obtain adequate standards of government in many of the major fields it seeks to enter. It is hamstrung, partly by the division of powers from which it derives its authority; partly because the Constitution has not enabled it to develop the instrumentalities essential to the purposes it must seek to fulfill. Its effort to obtain the proper recognition of collective bargaining may be stricken into impotence by a state law against picketing. Its effort to produce proper control of public utilities may be ren-

the recognition of the need for uniformity in this field had not dawned upon the public consciousness. So, also, with conservation; with the provision of adequate educational opportunity; with the effective prohibition (a commonplace of any well ordered state) of child labor; with the coördination of relief for unemployment; with public works, especially in the utilization of the possible sources of electric power; with public-health legislation, not least in the field of maternity and child hygiene; with a proper policy of public roads—witness the breakdown of federal-state coöperation in Arkansas in 1923, in Kansas in 1926 and Maine in 1929; with a proper policy in housing. I take examples only. The central point of my argument is the simple one that in every major field of social regulation, the authority of which the federal government can dispose is utterly inadequate to the issues it is expected to solve.

I do not think this argument is invalidated by the rise of coöperation between the federal government and the states, or between groups of states. That use has been carefully investigated in detail by Professor Jane Clark in an admirable and exhaustive monograph ("The Rise of a New Federalism," 1938). When all is made that can be made of the pattern she there reveals, I think it is true to say that, compared to the dimension of the problem, it amounts to very little. And set in the background of the urgent problems of time, it is, I think, clear from her account that in no fundamental matters will the pressure of political interests (behind which can be seen at every turn the hand of giant capitalism) permit the necessary uniformities to be attained by consent within the next fifty years. Not even the resiliency of American democracy can afford to wait so long. Professor Clark demonstrates admirably the inescapable interest of the federal government in a hundred subjects at every turn of which it encounters the power of the states; but she also demonstrates that the problems of dual occupancy of the same ground hinders at every turn the creative solution of the problems involved unless we conceive of those solutions in terms of geological time.

I am not arguing that the administration of government services ought to be centralized in Washington. It is true, as Professor Clark says, that "there is a line beyond which centralized administration cannot go without falling because of its own weight." My argument is the very different one: that (a) there are certain objects of administrative control now left to the states for which they are no longer suitable units of regulation. Economic centralization makes necessary at least minimum standards of uniform performance in these objects, *e.g.*, health, education, unemployment relief; and in others, *e.g.*, labor conditions, railroad rates, electric power, complete federal control without interference by the states; and (b) that the proper

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pendent upon state consent. Where this dependency exists, state consent will be, in its turn, largely controlled by giant capitalism. That is why Delaware is merely a pseudonym of the du Ponts, and Montana little more than a symbol of the Anaconda Copper Corporation. That is why the people of the state of Washington, who ought long ago to have been permitted to have the advantage of the municipal electric-power plant of Seattle, still suffer from the division of its potential benefits through the survival of the Puget Sound Light and Power Company.

Nor would the problem be met if, instead of the states, America were divided, as writers like Professor Howard Odum suggest, into regions more correspondent with the economic realities of the situation. If America were to consist of seven or nine regions, instead of forty-eight states, that would still leave unsolved the main issues if they operated upon the basis of the present division of powers, and if their consent were necessary to any fundamental change in that division. Once again, it must be emphasized that the unity which giant capitalism postulates in the economic sphere postulates a corresponding unity in the conference of political powers upon the federal government. There is no other way, up to a required minimum, in which the questions of taxation, labor relations and conditions, conservation, public utilities (in the widest sense), to take examples only, can be met.

At this point, of course, the relation of a federal system to the power of judicial review becomes fundamental. No one now believes Marshall's famous assertion that "courts are the mere instruments of the law, and can will nothing"; it has been obvious, above all since the Civil War, that the Supreme Court is the effective master of federal legislation. And it is clear, further, that this mastery is exercised in the main not on objective tests of constitutionality (which do not exist), but upon the accident of a temporary majority's view of what it is "reasonable" for the federal government to undertake. The Court has become a non-elective third chamber of the government which may, as in the income-tax cases, defeat for many years purposes of which its members do not happen to approve. In an epoch of rapid change, it is a grave danger to any society that the will of a federal legislature should be subject to judicial control, and more especially when, as Marshall said, the amending process is "cumbrous and unwieldy." In a phase of liberal construction the difficulties of judicial review are obscured from the public. But the years before the controversy over the President's Court plan should be a sufficient reminder of the immense dangers lurking within it.

The view here urged, of course, looks toward a fundamental reconstruction of traditional American institutions. It is not impressed by the view, associated with the great name of [illegible], that the "curse of bigness" will descend upon any serious departure from the historic contours of federalism. The small unit of government is impotent against the big unit of giant capitalism. It may be that the very power of giant capitalism is no longer of itself compatible with the maintenance of a democratic political structure in society; there is much evidence to support this view. What, at least, is certain is this: that a government the powers of which are not commensurate with its problems will not be able to cope with them. Either, therefore, it must obtain those powers, or it must yield to a form of state more able to satisfy the demands that it encounters. That is the supreme issue before the United States today; and the more closely it is scrutinized the more obviously does its resolution seem to be bound up with the obsolescence of the federal system.

For that system presents the spectacle of forty-nine governments seeking to deal with issues for many of which they are inappropriate as instrumentalities whether in the area they cover or in the authority they may invoke. They are checked and balanced upon a theory of the state completely outmoded in the traditional ends upon which its postulates are based. Giant industry requires a positive state; federalism, in its American form, is geared to vital negations which contradict the implications of positivism. Giant industry requires uniformities in the field of its major influence; American federalism is the inherent foe, both in time and space, of those necessary uniformities. Giant industry, not least, requires the opposition of a unified public will to counteract its tendency to undemocratic procedure through the abuse of power; a federal system of the American kind dissipates the unity of public opinion in those fields where it is most urgently required. And, above all, it is urgent to note that giant industry, in an age of economic contraction, is able to exploit the diversities of a federal scheme, through the delays they permit in the attainment of uniformity, to reactionary ends. Thereby, they discredit the democratic process at a time when it is least able to afford that discredit. For, thereby, the confidence of the citizen body in its power to work out democratic solutions of its problems is gravely undermined.

Men who are deprived of faith by inability to attain results they greatly desire do not long remain content with the institutions under which they live. The price of democracy is the power to satisfy living demands. American federalism, in its traditional form, cannot keep pace with the tempo of the life giant capitalism has evolved. To judge it in terms of its historic success is to misconceive the criteria by which it becomes valid for the present and the future. No political system has the privilege of immortality; and there is no moment so fitting for the consideration of its remaking as that which permits of reconstruction with the prospect of a new era of creative achievement.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not in the Cables

Georges Bonnet and His Foreign Policy

The time seems near when Britain and France will ask American support in the second war to save democracy, which their own reactionary policies have put in mortal danger. In these circumstances Americans should be informed about the characters and aims of those European statesmen at whose invitation they are supposed to sacrifice their honor, fortunes and lives. The following article, written a few weeks before Hitler's invasion of Czecho-Slovakia, is of special interest today, now that the French government has consolidated its position by obtaining dictatorial powers. Bonnet is still part of that government.—THE EDITORS

THERE IS LITTLE DOUBT that the most despised man in France today is Foreign Minister Georges Bonnet. But Bonnet is also the most feared man in France. Parliamentarians belonging to his own party—the Radical Socialists—frequently assert, in private conversations, that some day Bonnet will be tried as a traitor. It is well known that he is intensely disliked by Premier Daladier, and rumors are circulating about their quarrels, which are caused by, or result in, important political and diplomatic moves made independently by both. In theory, Daladier has the right to fire his Foreign Minister at any time; but in practice matters are not so simple. Bonnet is the direct agent of the powerful Banque Lazard and the London City interests which rule over the franc. Bonnet is also backed by the President of the Republic, Lebrun. Thus, the man whose policies are disapproved by an overwhelming majority of Frenchmen, because they so obviously go against France's national interests, remains at the head of the Quai d'Orsay.

Like so many other French politicians, Georges Bonnet has come to power as a man of the Left and a champion of social progress. For a long time he had been an employee of the Banque Lazard that he now serves in a much higher capacity. He was launched on his political career by the progressive Radical Socialist, Camille Pelletan, whose niece Bonnet married. Soon after Bonnet was elected to Parliament, another Radical Socialist, Paul Painlevé, took him into his Cabinet. From then on Bonnet's rise was steady. Compromised in the Stavisky scandal, he was saved by the Popular Front movement; today, having in no small measure contributed to the defeat of the Popular Front, his efforts are directed towards splitting the Radical Socialist Party and transforming France into a "co-[illegible] which he hopes to be one of the

to his personal advantage the opportunities offered him by his strategic post as Foreign Minister. In the most important European countries, Bonnet's secret envoys, who are at the same time representatives of high finance, are duplicating the work of the official ambassadors. In Berlin, Bonnet's agent is the Count de Brinon, who, according to the charge publicly made by the Rightist deputy Henri de Kérillis, has distributed in a few months over three hundred million francs of German money to the French nationalistic and pacifist press. (The venality of the French newspapers has now reached a new low: cynics assert that no one but the most incurable imbecile refuses to accept de Brinon's money; and recently a Paris magazine opened a public subscription for the "repurchase of the venal press"!) In Rome, Bonnet's unofficial collaborator is M. Baudoin, director general of the Banque d'Indochine and member on the board of several Italian metallurgical and chemical trusts controlled by the Ciano family. A few weeks ago, at the very time when Premier Daladier was touring the African provinces and defying Mussolini's demands in highly patriotic speeches, M. Baudoin, acting on Bonnet's instructions, was offering far-reaching concessions to Italy, comprising shares in the Suez Canal and the Jibuti Railway, a free port zone in Jibuti, a perpetual autonomous status for the Italian inhabitants of Tunisia, etc.

Bonnet's complacency toward France's enemies is complemented by his double-crossing tactics with regard to France's allies and friends. Nearly everybody knows how Czecho-Slovakia, after having been urged by Bonnet to show intransigence toward the Sudeten leaders, was later faced with France's and England's "irresistible pressure" to surrender to Hitler. Although less widely advertised, Bonnet's part in hastening the fall of the Republican regime in Spain and the recognition of Franco by the European powers is equally great. Not only did Bonnet recognize Franco, but he recognized him without obtaining the slightest advantage for his own country, while promising at the same time the complete return to Franco of the gold and munitions brought by the retreating Loyalists.

With regard to England, Bonnet's game consisted in intimating to the British Foreign Office that France would never go to war, while explaining in France that Britain would never participate in a war on the Continent. At the height of the Munich crisis, on September 26, when the British Foreign Office published a release stating Britain's unconditional support

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the authenticity of that document and denounced it as a deliberate provocation by the Socialist and Communist "war-mongers." Since Munich, these deliberate tactics of confusing French public opinion have reached such proportions that recently M. Jules Jeanneney, president of the Senate, after having heard one of Bonnet's innumerable "denials" at the Foreign Affairs Committee, declared before a gathering of newspapermen: "In the olden times, there was false news and true news. Nowadays the false news is the true news. With all this true false news it is pretty hard to find one's way. And if we add that all this false true news or true false news is usually followed by denials, and that these denials are in their turn followed by counter-denials, you must understand that it is really quite impossible to know where one stands." It is quite clear that M. Bonnet has made use of the traditional hesitations of the British diplomats, and their reluctance to take a clear-cut attitude, to justify his own defeatist policy and to advance the fascization of the European continent.

Apart from the outright Fascists and the friends he buys, M. Bonnet has powerful allies among certain corrupt groups of labor officials. He is closely connected with those trade-union leaders who deliberately aim at splitting the French labor movement by dissociating it, in the name of pacifism, from any anti-Fascist action.

Thanks to his powerful backing, Bonnet is beyond the normal control of parliamentary institutions. Everything in his actions points to the existence of a carefully worked-out plan to confuse French public opinion into a defeatist frame of mind and to establish a dictatorial government whose main function will be the destruction of the remaining French liberties. So long as Bonnet is in the saddle, and in spite of any appearances to the contrary, there will be no resistance against fascism. Instead we can look forward to the suppression of the free press, the establishment of concentration camps for the opposition and the end of independent labor unions.

Paris GALLICUS

Marxist Humanism

ONE OF THE MOST STRIKING FEATURES of the political commentary of Marx and Engels, if we return to it after the journalism and the political "theses" of the later phases of Marxism, is precisely its flexibility, its readiness to take account of new facts. Though the mainspring of the Dialectic was conceived as a very simple mechanism, the day-by-day phenomena of society were regarded by Marx and Engels as infinitely varied and complex. If they were mystical about the goal, they were realistic about the way of getting there. Certain assumptions they had carried over from the more idealistic era of "The Communist Manifesto"; but these never blocked their realization that their hypothesis must fit actual facts. There are many respects in which Marx and Engels may be contrasted with the crude pedants and fanatics who have pretended to speak for the movement which Marx and Engels started; but none is more obvious than the honesty of these innovators in recognizing and respecting events and their willingness to learn from experience.

With this went an omnivorous interest in all kinds of intellectual activity and an appreciation of the work of others. This last may not seem easily reconcilable with the tendency we have noticed in Marx to split off from and to shut out other thinkers or with his habitual tone of scornful superiority and the earnest imitation of it by Engels. There are many passages in the Marx-Engels correspondence in which these two masters of political thought, who, like Dante (much quoted for [illegible]

by themselves, seem perversely, even insanely, determined to grant no merit to the ideas of anyone else. Yet it is as if this relentless exclusion of others were an indispensable condition for preserving their own sharply angled point of view.

It is as if they had developed their special cutting comic tone, their detached and implacable attitude, their personal polyglot language ("Apropos! Einige Portwein und Claret wird mir sehr wohl tun under present circumstances"; "Die verfluchte vestry hat mich bon gré mal gré zum 'constable of the vestry of St. Pancras' erwählt") in proportion as they have come to realize that they can take in more and more of the world, that they can comprehend it better and better, while other men, vulgarly addicted to the conviviality of political rhetoric, have never caught the sense of history at all, have no idea what is happening about them. Inside that reciprocal relationship, limited to the interchange of two men, all is clarity, coolness, intellectual exhilaration, self-confidence. The secret conspiracy and the private joke conceal a watch-tower and a laboratory.

And here, in the general field of thought, if not always in that of practical politics, Marx and Engels are candidly alert for anything in science or literature which can help them to understand man and society. The timid man who seizes a formula because he wants above everything certainty, the snob who accepts a doctrine because it will make him feel superior to his fellows, the second or third-rate man who wants an excuse for

LICENSED TO UMI BY NYP
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the truculence of Marx and Engels, which has come down as a part of the tradition, is the only part of their equipment they can imitate.

But to the real pioneers of the frontiers of thought, to those who have accepted the responsibility for directing the ideas of mankind, to supply the right answer to every problem is far from appearing so easy. Such pioneers are painfully aware how little men already know, how few human beings can be counted on even to try to find out anything new, to construct a fresh picture of experience. Though Marx and Engels trusted the Dialectic, they did not believe it would do everything for them without initiative or research on their part nor did they imagine that it was incapable of effecting its progress through persons with whom they disagreed. Hypercritical and harsh though Marx is in his strictures on such a competitor as Proudhon, his sense of intellectual realities did compel him to do Proudhon justice; and he was punctilious to the point of pedantry in making acknowledgments not merely to such predecessors as Ricardo and Adam Smith, but even to the author of an anonymous pamphlet published in 1740, in which he had found the first suggestion of the Labor Theory of Value.

Also, the Marxism of the founders themselves never developed into that further phase, where it was to be felt by the noblest of those working-class leaders who had accepted Dialectical Materialism, that all their thought should be strictly functional—that is, agitational and strategic; that they must turn their backs on non-political interests, not because these were lacking in value but because they were irrelevant to what had to be done. The tradition of the Renaissance still hung about Marx and Engels: they had only partly emerged from its matrix. They wanted to act on the course of history, but they also loved learning for its own sake—or perhaps it would be more accurate to say that they believed that learning gave power; and for all the intensity of Marx's desire to defeat the antagonist in the class struggle, he declared that his favorite maxim was "*Nihil humanum alienum puto*"; and he and Engels approached the past with a respect that had nothing in common with the impulse which figured in one phase of the Russian Revolution and which was imitated by Marxists in other countries: the impulse to make a clean slate of culture.

Engels's championship of the Humanities in "Anti-Dühring" might indeed be cordially approved by any defender of the "Liberal Arts" education. "The people's school of the future" projected by Herr Dühring, says Engels, is to be "merely a somewhat 'ennobled' Prussian grammar school in which Greek and Latin are replaced by a little more pure and applied mathematics and in particular by the elements of the philosophy of reality, and the teaching of German brought back to Becker, that is, to about a Third Form level." Dühring as it is today give at least the opportunity of rising above the narrow national standpoint: knowledge of the ancient languages, which opens a wider common horizon at least to those who have had a classical education; and knowledge of modern languages, through the medium of which alone the people of different nations can make themselves understood by one another and acquaint themselves with what is happening beyond their own frontiers."—"As for the esthetic side of education, Herr Dühring will have to fashion it all anew. The poetry of the past is worthless. Where all religion is prohibited, it goes without saying that the 'mythological or other religious trimmings' characteristic of poets in the past cannot be tolerated in this school. 'Poetic mysticism,' too, 'such as, for example, Goethe practised so extensively' is to be condemned. Well, Herr Dühring will have to make up his mind to produce for us those poetic masterpieces which 'are in accord with the higher claims of an imagination reconciled to reason,' and which represent the pure ideal that 'denotes the perfection of the world.' Let him lose no time about it! The conquest of the world will be achieved by the economic commune [proposed by Herr Dühring] only on that day when the latter, reconciled to reason, comes in at the double in Alexandrines."

And Marx and Engels had always before them—something which many Marxists have quite lost sight of—the ideal of the Renaissance man like Leonardo or Machiavelli, who understood both the sciences and the arts, who was both philosopher and man of action. It was, in fact, one of their chief objections to the stratified industrial society of their time that it specialized people in occupations in such a way as to make it impossible for them to develop more than a single aptitude; and it was one of their great arguments for communism that it would produce "complete" men again. They themselves had shied desperately away from the pundits of idealist Germany, whom they regarded as just as fatally deformed through a specialization in intellectual activity as the proletarian who worked in a factory through his concentration on mechanical operations; and they desired, themselves, in so far as they could, to lead the lives of "complete" men. Something of the kind Engels certainly achieved, with his business, his conviviality, his sport, his languages, his natural sciences, his economics, his military studies, his article-writing, his books, his drawings and verses, and his politics; and what Marx lacked in practical ability and athletic skill he made up for by the immense range of his mind. It is true that the work of Marx himself, merging into and almost swamping that of Engels, had to become, under the pressure of the age, more technically and grimly economic; but there is still in Marx and Engels to the end that sense of a rich and various world, that conception of many kinds of mastery possible for human beings, all interesting

DIGITISED BY IZNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Elegy for Ataturk

In Turkey, on a hilltop overlooking a vast Anatolian plateau and a city which fifteen years ago did not exist, Kemal Ataturk lies buried in a Museum of Ethnography. Outside, the austere figure of the general, seated on his horse, is mounted high in the bone-dry air, calm, portentous, his eager horse about to step from the wreath-carved base. Inside, amid a loud clatter of unpleasant echoes, are encased the insignia of the Whirling Dervishes and other impedimenta of a mighty, fanatical Islam which, in the same fifteen years, has been relegated from a political present to an ethnographical past.

In the funeral procession walked President Ismet Inonu, the man best fitted, in the eyes of eighteen million Turks, to succeed Ataturk. That day they gave him scarcely a glance in their mourning. He worked with Ataturk for twenty years, as chief of his staff at the Caucasus front, at the Syrian front in the World War, as secret ally in the Ministry of War in Constantinople while Kemal was organizing rebellion in Anatolia, as a Minister of the Revolution, as head of the army that repulsed the victorious Greeks. He conducted the armistice of Mudania with the Allies that ended Greek occupation. At Lausanne he ended special foreign rights in Turkey, and through exchange of populations struck the first blow for national unity and for the abolition of the *millets*—independent racial groups of Armenians, Bulgarians, Jews, Syrians, Arabs and Greeks who were not Turkish citizens.

For thirteen years he had been premier, watching over the new state. He heard the new legislation as it was being formulated by its creator. He saw eye to eye with Ataturk in his main policies, differing at times as to methods of carrying them out. He prepared, with Celal Bayer, present premier and former Minister of National Economy, the two five-year plans which have organized and synthesized the rapid economic development of Turkey. He is said to be practical, resourceful, diplomatic, stubborn and a fine executive with a genius for detail. Inonu will carry on the state. It is a state realistically and wisely organized to suit the fundamental welfare of a people in a grim plight. Nothing need be added or changed for years to come. In this organization Inonu worked, and he will carry it forward. In foreign affairs he will give Turkey his skill as a diplomat, higher, it is said, than that of Ataturk.

There has probably never before been in history a revolution that accomplished so much in so short a time, nor one so completely dominated by the genius of a single man. That man was a general, educated solely in the military schools of the Ottoman Empire, leading ragged soldiers to success against the British at against the Sultan and the Allies, but turning suddenly into a statesman, formulating the constitution of a republic, making bold decisions of policy so suddenly and compellingly that objections could not arise, leading a whole people to literacy, new laws, new ways of thought, new family life, new schools, machines and, above all, new interpretations of an old religion. It was a religion that penetrated to all departments of life with the almost literal tenets of a prophet living thirteen centuries earlier. The battle against Islam as the base for the whole political, economic and social life of Turkey was the first and, in a sense, the complete accomplishment of Ataturk, now lying at rest in Ankara while eighteen million Moslems continue to mourn.

What was this Islam? It was a legal system that attempted to cover all aspects of living as dealt with specifically by Mohammed in his revelation from the Angel Gabriel—the Koran—and in his deeds and sayings—the Hadith—as interpreted by four Mohammedan doctors in the ninth century, who furthermore set up elaborate rules for future interpretation. The Sultan-Caliph was the head. When the Sultan, deposed, fled to a British battleship, the Sheik-ul-Islam remained, the head of the doctors of law who for centuries had ruled on every important decision as to its conformity with religious law. He had declared the World War a Holy War, and had pronounced a *fetva* applying the criminal code to Mustapha Kemal.

There is grim humor in the edict of the first Grand National Assembly at Ankara in 1920 decreeing the headquarters of the Sheik-ul-Islam and the whole Ministry of the Evkaf to be at Ankara. The Assembly also declared its right to make laws independent of Islamic treatises. This was only an attempt. Kemal had to move slowly. His generals and his people were Moslems. A new Caliph was elected, in 1922, with spiritual power only. Kemal turned his attention to the political state. On October 29, 1923, he proclaimed the Turkish Republic. In 1924, the Caliphate was abolished, having become "a historical memory." This was the beginning of the Turkish revolution. Even then, so fixed in the minds of the Assembly was the idea of reforming the persons holding high office—not the office—that deputies suggested to Kemal that he become Caliph. He responded: "Do not attempt to make me ridiculous by tricking me out in a fantastic role." Thus the head of Islam for eleven centuries went down. Kemal had stumped the countryside to tell the people that a recent move to make the Caliph head of a Pan-Islamic union the world over was nonsense, that such a union was a "fool's paradise."

The affairs of Islam were placed under a Presidency

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made up of deputies appointed by the premier. The vast wealth of the Evkaf was controlled by the state. All functionaries of Islam, down to the *muezzin* who calls to prayer from the minaret, became employees of the state. Today, the Presidency of Religious Affairs writes sermons for use in the mosques, building up a new integration of Moslem faith and state objectives.

But Islam underlay all education and law. In 1924, the Moslem schools were closed. These were the famous *medressehs*, theological seminaries which taught, in Arabic, books of religious law, a little philosophy and no science, and the parish schools next to the mosques, where children learned to repeat chapters of the Koran in a language of which they knew nothing. There were few secondary and high schools. The small number of lay schools, the military schools, the University of Istanbul—all education was placed under a Ministry of Public Instruction, and the Republic set itself the stupendous task of installing a whole new system. Even so, the first Turkish census, in 1927, showed 28,705 mosques and 14,425 schools.

In Turkey today there are kindergartens, primary schools, secondary schools, normal schools for music, painting, manual professions and physical culture, professional schools, high schools and universities. Education under the state is compulsory, free for all but the well-to-do but carrying in certain technical schools, when free, an obligation to teach for three years for the government after training has been completed. The schools are co-educational and the teaching has practical application to life. Educational methods resemble those called "progressive" in the United States. Trade schools in particular flourish. This writer will never forget a school in Ankara where boys between the ages of thirteen and sixteen were learning the building trades—masonry, carpentry, roofing, plastering, woodwork and furniture-making—preparing to go back to their villages to build houses and shops for Turkey at high pay. At eighteen they are village architects. The work of these boys, who built their school as part of their training, was amazing. Education in Turkey is, perhaps, the leading miracle of Ataturk.

In 1924 the religious courts and judges were also abolished and the organic statutes of the Republic were elaborated. But in 1925, the work of the state was impeded by rebellious Kurds, fanatically religious tribes. It was then that the fez, "which sat on our heads like a symbol of ignorance, of fanaticism, of hatred against progress and civilization," was abolished by Ataturk. The fez distinguished the Turk from the westerner, but the fez and the cloth wound round the fez had made two classes of Turks, lay and clerical. Moreover, being brimless, it allowed the too-easy, empty touching of the forehead to the ground five times a day in prayer. It was Kemal's thrust at the fanaticism of the most ignorant in a way that they could understand.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the dictator of political, social and economic life. Kemal closed the holy graves and the secret religious orders as a further reminder. The Whirling Dervishes were no more. That year, clocks and calendars took on western faces.

In 1926, the Turkish Civil Code replaced all statutes of the Koran. This code, adapted from the Swiss, made far-reaching changes in marriage, divorce and family relations. Women were given legal rights; polygamy and harems came to an end. The Law on Debts, the Turkish Penal Code and the Commercial Code were adopted that year. Judges and lawyers had to change, after six months' study, from oriental to occidental code, a tremendous revolution in itself. Thus Islam was removed from the law.

In 1928 the article that proclaimed Islam to be the state religion of Turkey was removed from her constitution, and the Koran as the oath of office was replaced by an oath of honor. Freedom of religious thought was ensured in a new article. In the law of citizenship, passed at this time, Islamic religion is not a qualification.

There remained the necessity of eliminating Islam from the eye and from the very form in which ideas enter the mind. The language of Islam and of education had been Arabic. The characters of the Turkish tongue were Arabic, although lay people could not read them. The first census showed only 8.16 percent of a population of 13,600,000 able to read. A whole nation had to learn international numerals. Then, on October 3, 1928, a new alphabet in Latin type was ready. The next year adult education such as the world had never known was teaching a nation to read and write its own language. Between 1928 and 1936, 1,393,941 persons learned to read and write in the evening schools. The metric system was introduced in 1931, and finally, in 1934, all clerical garb—Moslem, Russian, Greek Orthodox, Catholic—disappeared from the streets, to be worn only during religious services. The *muezzin* calls to prayer from the minaret in Turkish, wearing European clothes. Allah is *Tanri*. The disappearance of the jaunty red fez and the white and green turbans and black gowns from the famous Galata Bridge, so much bewailed by tourists, means that a whole nation, in a few short years, has broken the grip of Islam on its lay society. In 1935 Turks were compelled to take family names and titles were abolished. Sunday became the day of rest for all religions.

But Turkish was encumbered with Arabic and Persian words, dragging in complicated grammar. The Society for the Study of the Turkish Language was recently founded by Ataturk to study philology and write dictionaries. Turkish words are sent in from remote villages to be published in the newspapers. Everybody is interested. Ataturk had this work near his heart to the last, and himself studied philology. In 1937 this writer had a morning appointment with the president

can Embassy with the apology that "the president had been kept up very late that night by the President of the Republic." It is this ruthlessness, pushing reforms that look fanatical to the outsider but rouse a people out of fatalistic superstition, that made Ataturk great.

All these reforms were undertaken boldly by Ataturk while many of his deputies could not even see what there was to reform. He made use of every emergency of the new government to strike at Islam. He showed again and again that it was not practical to keep the old Islam, and at the same time build a state which gives land to the peasants and machines to the land.

A rider on a horse—a grave in a museum—but a man who could say to deputies in the grip of bewildering necessities: "Gentlemen, it is an actual fact. In reality you have nothing to discuss. It has come to a question of merely giving expression to what has long been an accomplished fact." So the dictator overruled the Assembly; it is better to say that this man recognized and obeyed the supreme dictatorship of facts.

While the acacia trees had time to grow only to the second story of buildings in Ankara, the will of a strong man raised a framework far higher, founded a new state, eradicated Islam, set up new laws and education, a new economic system, transformed a country. Turkey today looks poor, the old palaces are shabby, people never seem to have new clothes. But the Turks have hope. They walk with the step of those pushing forward in a single cause.

Any foreigner who has been in Turkey and visited Ankara, who has talked with government officials and possesses the slightest inkling of the changes instituted by the late Gazi, must feel the loss of this man and mourn with the Turkish people. The horseman in Ankara looks out over the desert, still summoning the Anatolian peasant to new life, literacy, work and hope. His own words might be his epitaph: "Those inclined to compromise cannot accomplish a revolution."

MARGUERITE ARNOLD

Sheepbells in Autumn

Over stubble frost, through bleakly huddled
Unstarring air, sheep drift, like loose fog, to slow
Raw tonkles; over a ditch old-puddled
With thunder rain in August, they go
Unhurried by caws rasping autumn and the ram's
Bell echo.

Like an old ewe weary of lambs
A wife stares under wild ducks in a high wedge
At worn sheep blurring in cluster after the bronze
Jargoning. Up hillside frost that steams
To mire the flock gray-climbs, like her gray dreams
Submissive as pod dropping seed in the dawn's
Hiss—dreams slowed to the bell
And sheep cold-nibbling the sun at autumn's edge.

Shoot the Works

The Passing of Shaw's Mentor

IN BRIGHTON, ENGLAND, at the age of eighty-seven, died Henry S. Salt. According to the A. P. dispatch, his end was caused by a complication of diseases, but his life seems to have been curiously simple. For sixty years he ate no flesh and probably the most important thing in his career was the fact that he made a convert of a man who later became one of the most active proselyters of the age. It was Mr. Salt who moved Mahatma Gandhi to become a vegetarian. And, also, as a friend of George Bernard Shaw, it seems likely that here too Henry Salt, obscure himself, affected the pulse of world affairs.

This assistant master at Eton (1875-84) reached out a hand and put an impelling thumb into both politics and literature. Shaw, after he had touched seventy, once remarked with a kind of nostalgic bravado that no woman in Great Britain would have been safe if he had been addicted to underdone lamb chops. Come to think of it, this came from Mrs. Pat Campbell and not from Shaw. Well, all the better, she may have been in a position to give a shrewder decision on that point than Shaw himself. Of course, the precise amount of Don Juanery from which Shaw was saved by Salt must remain in the field of speculation. It is a problem for the actuaries. The effect of vegetarianism on Gandhi may well have been of greater world import. Who knows what blood might have coursed through the streets of Bombay and Calcutta if the loincloth revolutionist had ever gorged himself on British beef? A slight change in the menu might have made another Indian mutiny, for vitamins can transform a Sitting Bull into a contented cow.

After noting the names of Shaw and Gandhi, the commentator must descend many rungs of the ladder of civilization before hitting upon another well known vegetarian to complete the trilogy. The triple-threat man among the running backs unquestionably is Bernarr Macfadden, proprietor of Liberty and Physical Culture. But here the record is a little blurred. There is no evidence that the American strong boy ever crossed the orbit of H. S. Salt of Eton. Bernarr and Bernard have met on numerous occasions and swapped comment on carrots and cabbage. In fact when Mr. Shaw passed an afternoon at Miami, Florida, a few years ago he was the house guest of the publisher, who has taken over Beautiful Deauville, once a gambling casino, and transformed it into a health resort where one can procure a filet mignon compounded wholly out of pecans and peanuts.

In a somewhat roundabout way Henry S. Salt, honorary secretary of the Humanitarian League from 1891 to 1920, may have touched the life of the man who started The New York Graphic. You could not call it a put-out, but the English classical scholar did toss the ball to Shaw, who passed it on to Bernarr—all of which means an assist for the gentleman who majored in Greek at Cambridge. If a certain gulf seems to loom between a don of King's College and the famous front-page composite picture of Daddy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

answer is that an oyster plant may be a sedative to some and aphrodisiacal to others. Mr. Macfadden took his vegetables raw.

The late Henry Salt, father of modern vegetarianism, seems to have been a wild man. His father was a colonel of the Royal Bengal Artillery and often absent from home on fixed-post assignment defending the Khyber Pass. Accordingly it is possible that any profound analysis of the causes which made the civilian Salt a humanitarian would have to include some nod to Freud as well as to lima beans and lettuce. Perhaps the little lad rebelled in his heart when his father toddled home at dawn, all dolled up in scarlet, and boasted of the manner in which British pluck and bulldog grit had once more sufficed to blow a hill tribe into smithereens with a few well placed projectiles. Quite often the sensitive boy did no more than nibble on the kipper or mutton chop which came steaming to the breakfast table on such mornings. And when he came to maturity he ate no meat at all, or fish, or the substance of any living creature. In his book "The Creed of Kinship" (long since out of print), Henry Salt wrote of his basic conviction that, "a kindly consideration for the rights of all our fellow beings, human or subhuman, is the basis of any religion, any morality worthy of the name." And in a later work, which has become a collector's item, he discussed the exploitation of man by man and the manner in which this practice has been extended by human beings in preying upon the animal kingdom. Unfortunately, I have no copy of the book at hand, but it suggests a vast railroad system of thoughts. The sergeant in the AEF who beat an army mule unmercifully might have been moved to this violence by some passing word of censure from a second lieutenant. The Ethiopian gobbled up by Mussolini in his ambition for world empire could console himself by gulping a Cotuit. Indeed the goldfish craze now sweeping through the institutions of higher learning may well be explained as a manifestation of the inferiority complex expressing itself in a desire to maximate the ego by devouring some more feeble creature. Mr. Salt expressed it succinctly by saying, "In all cases the aggressor takes advantage of some neighbor's weakness. Whether he cheats them or eats them is but a detail." Very well put, old fellow.

And yet the kindly classicist set for himself and the rest of mankind an ideal incapable of fulfilment. Salt's vegetarianism was based on moral rather than medical grounds. He did not eschew pork chops and beef *à la mode* because he thought these delicacies deleterious, but wholly out of pity for swine and horses. Feeling a fellowship toward all living creatures, however humble, he curtailed the existence of nothing but sprouts and salads. But at this precise point comes the rub. As science advances it becomes increasingly difficult to draw a boundary line between the animal and the vegetable kingdom. The ameba and the artichoke may be brothers under the skin. There are plants so sensitive that they blush when exposed to any searching light.

But Henry Salt seems to have been a man of wit as well as wisdom. He did the best he could under the limitations which the cosmos imposes upon us. His was a good life, and as one who never even heard of him until I read his obit, I regret that it was not my privilege to sit down with this

Washington Notes

The Fever Mounts

SOME OF THE SHREWDEST APPRAISALS of congressional sentiment come from the agents of business here. According to report, an elaborate poll was recently made of members of the Senate and House to determine their attitude toward a European war. A small majority was found in each chamber to be in favor of American neutrality. But the poll also revealed that this sentiment for neutrality rested on an extremely fragile base. The members of Congress, as might be expected, were overwhelmingly sympathetic to the English-French coalition. Except for a tiny group, exemplified by such men as Senators Borah and Nye, no one thought that this country either ought to permit, or would permit, the German-Italian axis and its Japanese appendage to gain victory in a world war. The significant disclosure made by the poll, consequently, was that Congress has in fact utterly abandoned its former isolationist position. Congress is in favor of neutrality if, and only if, the English-French coalition can beat Hitler and Mussolini anyhow. Furthermore, the narrowness of the majority supporting neutrality suggests that new acts of aggression by the totalitarian powers would drive Congress into open support of the English-French side.

Last month it was reported in these Notes that the White House advisers were relying on the shock and horror of the opening days of war to make possible changes in the Neutrality Act. Convinced that Congress could then readily be persuaded to authorize the export of airplanes and other munitions, they wished to avoid a long-drawn-out wrangle in the Senate that totalitarian propagandists would be certain to exploit as national disunity. Recently the mood of the White House group has shifted. The administration is now actively pressing for the amendments fathered by Senator Pittman, and is even nursing a move for the repeal of the Neutrality Act that shows particular strength in the House. They no longer fear debate; they think that Mr. Roosevelt at last has the mass of voters with him.

The last few days have witnessed the dynamiting of Mr. Bennett Champ Clark's presidential candidacy. It is suffering, indeed, from multiple explosions. The political bicycle on which Mr. Clark intended to pedal to victory in the 1940 Democratic convention was the distrust of Europe always latent in the American people. Back in 1935, at the time of the Nye munitions investigation, the apparent desire of the country to withdraw into isolation seemed extremely strong. It looked like a high-geared vehicle well designed for an ambitious politician. Mr. Clark was highly pleased with it even as late as last February, when he led the attack on Mr. Roosevelt's famous "secret" conference with the Senate Military Affairs Committee. But Mr. Clark now behaves as if he suspected it had sprung a sprocket, and his attacks on the Roosevelt foreign policy have become correspondingly uncertain and confused. Simultaneously, Mr. Lloyd C. Stark, Governor of Mr. Clark's native

NEW SERVICE UNDER COPYRIGHT
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the power of Boss Pendergast of Kansas City. There is a flurry of talk to the effect that Mr. Stark would make a winning presidential nominee against Mr. Dewey, if the latter should be chosen by the Republicans—one Hawkshaw against another. As Governor, Mr. Stark will have greater resources for bagging convention delegates than will Mr. Clark; moreover, as a result of Mr. Stark's recent visit to the White House, it seems probable that he will have administration help. Unless Mr. Clark can command a unanimous Missouri delegation, his chances for nomination become extremely small. Finally, the importance of the Clark boom has always rested on the assumption that he would have the backing of Vice President Garner, who was believed to regard Bennett as his favorite child. But it has suddenly grown painfully apparent that Papa is himself running for President; the Garner delegates will be delivered to Garner, not Clark.

Another exploded candidacy is that of Dear Alben Barkley. Mr. Barkley has been a wise-money favorite because of the notion that the 1940 candidate would necessarily have to be someone mutually acceptable to Mr. Roosevelt and the powerful Southern reactionaries of the Senate—that and the fact that he can yell louder than any other man in public life. Since he defeated Senator Harrison for the majority leadership two years ago, the regard of the Senate reactionaries for Mr. Barkley has been less than burning; when he was repudiated by Mr. Roosevelt during the fight over the WPA-deficiency bill, his candidacy was ended.

There are now two active candidates for the Democratic nomination: Mr. Garner and the High Commissioner in the Philippines, Mr. Paul V. McNutt. Apparently as a move to forestall Mr. McNutt, Mr. Farley has gathered in the New York delegation. So far there is no recognized New Deal candidate, and, what seems worse, no organized, continuous effort to bring about the naming of New Deal convention delegates. Secretary Hopkins' ill health—such are the cruel weapons of politics—has been used by his party opponents as an argument against his nomination. Friends of Secretary Wallace, although not Mr. Wallace himself, are choking with anger at Mr. Hopkins' decision to establish a permanent home in Iowa. The likelihood that the Iowa delegation will support Mr. Hopkins in the convention is infinitesimal. Of the New Deal group, the two most discussed men are now Mr. Justice Douglas and Attorney General Murphy. The character of the publicity that accompanied Mr. Douglas' elevation to the Supreme Court has deeply impressed rank-and-file Democrats in Congress. Except for professional bitter-enders like Senator "Cotton Ed" Smith, Mr. Douglas has the support of every party faction. Young, self-made, blazing with energy, he stirs the same party enthusiasm that Mr. Dewey does among Republicans. There is no evidence, however, that he wishes to leave the Supreme Court for the hazards of politics. Mr. Murphy has made extraordinary progress towards cleaning up the federal judiciary. No other New Dealer has accomplished so much in so short a time, or shown himself so skillful in avoiding unnecessary enmities. As a candidate, however, he would be forced to face the South's dark prejudices against his church. Mr. Roosevelt still remains the New Deal's most probable candidate.

Other People's Money

Monopoly and Oligopoly

LAST OCTOBER Professor Charles A. Beard expressed the belief that nothing new would come out of the monopoly investigation which is now flourishing in Washington under the euphemistic title of the Temporary National Economic Committee. At the time I ventured to suggest in this column that Dr. Beard, whose judgments and writings I follow with great respect, might be in for a disappointment; and that "something quite new will come out of it." That fear has now been abundantly realized. The something new has even been given a name. It is being called "oligopoly."

When the Committee was about to get down to work, I suggested in this column that we should keep our eyes on the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce and the White House. That warning was put thus: "No one, I know, will credit this. But these gentlemen are getting ready to hamstring the anti-monopoly laws under the guise of fighting monopoly. We shall hear a lot of talk about monopoly, economic royalists and the like and we shall end with an effort to legalize monopolies through trade-association agreements, which is really the only kind of monopoly we have to fear" (July 6, 1938).

That committee has been looking into our economic system for some time and is still at it. On April 16, 1939, Mr. John H. Crider wrote in a special dispatch to The New York Times as follows:

> One of the major problems before the National Economic Committee is the matter of devising some workable and at the same time some socially desirable substitute for the anti-trust-law philosophy, should it be decided that the single standard of competition required by that doctrine is outmoded. While it cannot be said with finality that the anti-trust doctrine will be scrapped, there is ample evidence in the committee's record to show that several of the committee's outstanding members are thinking in terms of a new type of industry-by-industry regulation, a variation of the NRA idea, in which the amount of competition in a given industry or in related industries, would be determined on the basis of its social effect.

Oddly, this idea flourishes in the minds of those members who are usually associated with the New Deal movement. It takes various forms. For instance, Mr. Jerome Frank, who sits frequently for the SEC, has been playing with the idea that, while competition is all right in many industries, there are others in which it is socially undesirable. He goes so far as to suggest that, perhaps, monopoly might actually be enforced in certain industries—maybe the great basic material industries.

Then Mr. Thurman Arnold, who sits for the Department of Justice on the Committee, toys with a different idea. He fiddles with the dangerous notion that some form of combined trade agreements may be effected under the form of consent decrees.

And of course the Department of Commerce persist-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

business men devoted to the idea of "self-rule in business." In other words, the representatives of this administration have been, from the very beginning, devoted to the baleful idea which found its fullest flower in the NRA. And at every opportunity they seek to bring it back in various guises. The American people have learned much since they fell so insouciantly and naïvely for the reactionary philosophy of the NRA all wrapped up and served in the language and labels of liberalism. They now know that this idea of self-rule in industry is the underlying idea of the corporate state, which is the economic structure of fascism. Indeed The Times's reporter who chronicled the drift of the Committee toward self-regulation of industry spoke of the problem of "attempting to compromise between the extreme of fascism, on the one hand, and the extreme of laissez-faire on the other." And that is what this amounts to—an attempt to introduce a moderate amount of fascism into our economic system. But there is no such thing as a little fascism, any more than there can be a little garlic.

About the same time there drifted to my desk an extraordinary document from the National Work Shirt Manufacturers' Association. It was a bulletin dealing with a problem now before another New Deal agency, the Wages and Hours Administration. It seems that the Administration is charged with establishing a learner's minimum wage, lower than that of the journeyman. Many persons in the textile industry are clamoring for such a ruling. But the administration, according to this bulletin, refuses to comply. I do not know anything about the merits of the controversy. But what catches my fancy is the argument of the Work Shirt Manufacturers. They, it seems, are against fixing a lower wage for beginners. They must be paid the same wage as experienced workers. This will result in no learners being employed. It will therefore keep any further recruits out of the industry. It will keep costs high and bring about swift ruin of the less competent manufacturers. "To pay learners the minimum applicable to experienced workers makes it prohibitive to employ them and thus works to the benefit of the entire industry. In view of the deplorable plight in which we find ourselves it is *restriction of production* that is imperatively needed and the policy of the Administration effectively promotes this. It hangs out a sign 'Keep Out' to new entrants and builds a protective fence around those already in possession of the field. This should surely earn our gratitude and appreciation."

This is what, the Work Shirt Manufacturers inform me, is called the "oligopolizing" of the cotton-textile industry. It is to have not a monopoly but an oligopoly. The distinction is a very innocent one—it means that the industry, while not to be monopolized by one, is to be monopolized by a few.

This is the drift in American business, encouraged at every turn by the administration—the organization of industry into trade groups, with fences built around them and "keep out" signs everywhere, and the power to regulate the economic elements in the industry lodged in the hands of the employers.

If I were employed to draft a plan to bring about the speediest possible destruction of the present economic system I would put this plan first on the list. Yet it is the

April Openings

On April 11, there opened at the Guild Theatre a play called "The Second Man," the central figure of which was a young and presumably brilliant writer whom two women were trying very hard to get. There also figured in the play a good-hearted but sedate gentleman from the professions, references to Bertrand Russell, to the Colony, to a writer's need to leave the surface for the heart of things. The moral was that life, lived with brave enough gayety, was enough. By open ruse the four characters carried on their business of making up their own or somebody else's mind, and the play mounted through pets, pouts and reversals to the Woman-of-the-World's climax line (she having found the writer had some time slept with a woman): "Cad! Goodbye forever." The play was written by S. N. Behrman.

But that April opening was in 1927. This April Mr. Behrman opened at the Ethel Barrymore Theatre a new play called "No Time for Comedy," the central figure of which was a young and presumably brilliant writer whom two women were trying very hard to get. There also figured a crusty and sedate gentleman from the professions, references to John Gunther, to Jack and Charlie's, to a writer's need to leave the surface for the heart of things. In spite of pointed allusions to Spain and China, the moral was that life, lived with brave enough gayety, was enough.

Several other things entered, but a nice exercise is to sit down with a pencil and find how many of the attitudes and brave intentions have not been canceled out by an about-face in character or the author's prompt forgetting of them altogether. In "No Time for Comedy" there is a constant suggestion of uneasiness, almost an autobiographical defense of the lighter muses in a world of poverty and war. But the true preoccupation is, which woman is going to get him? S. N. Behrman gets his light effects by the use of characters who would be extremely peculiar types in any walk of life, and he gets his endings by revealing them all as Bobbsey Twins at heart, and he gets away with it by telling his patient, wide-eyed audiences: This is how it is in the world of Agonized (an SNB favorite) Creation.

The production is up to standard without much use of theatre imagination anywhere along the line. Katharine Cornell seems at times not to know what to make of it or do with herself: in the part as played there is only glamor, which could have been supplied by Dorothy Lamour. Laurence Olivier is given too much exquisite rope as the soul in creative torment; and they cast Margalo Gilmore as an embarrassing, awkward caricature, to which she replied by raising them one. The three people with easy theatre presence were Robert Flemyng, Gee Gee James and John Williams—to see whom at work was to catch the difference between a sound craftsman's tradition and the hollow nervous enthusiasm of a superior college show.

Speaking of it that way, the play looks bleak. Actually it isn't. The audience enjoys its twenty or thirty laugh-lines, the easy modernity of its conversations, and the sense of seeing how the near world is reflected in these remote and elegant spaces. You may of course become increasingly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rustling have deserved, and all in the interest of cooking up something enough newer than the last to shake $2.20 or $3.30 out of Park Avenue natives and World's Fair visitors. But forget it. The excitement of lights and curtain and stage motion, clever passages and the faintly spicy, the appeal of the names Cornell, Behrman, Olivier, McClintic, Mielziner, serve to give this organism its temporary life: this is an evening in a clean, well lighted place.

"My Heart's in the Highlands" is one of those frank evasions of the demand that a play be made like a play which tact rushes in to cover with the term Experimental Theatre. For all that, there is more human pressure per square foot than in from three to six acres of Mr. Behrman's neat parquet. It is an expansion of one of William Saroyan's two or three very best stories—indeed one of the lovely things among all short stories. With a miracle-play simplicity of setting and development (miracle-play, that is, via "The Living Newspaper," "Our Town" and other modern trick pieces), it makes a pleasant experience because of its sunny stretches of life among nice people.

The play shoots off at some vague cosmic angles in its later sections, and in this padding of the original idea has muffled its clear effect without adding anything (the old Saroyan trick of making his meaning high and inscrutable when he hasn't any). But the relations among the different kids are unstrained, the idea of an old and broken ham playing his bugle songs like a new pied piper is touching, and the father-and-son motive is as open and fine as it has ever been shown. Part of this is due to the sense, to the unaffected feeling and wisdom and humor behind the words; part of the credit goes to Philip Loeb and Sidney Lumet, who have brought out this sense and feeling in their father and son on the stage. Others too: Art Smith, William Hansen, Phil Brown and Mae Grimes, who is the world's own homely girl in pigtails.

The scenes ran about average and the music (Paul Bowles) was just the right music (though why they should have fostered that hollow attitude of the old man holding his prop auto horn for minutes while a thin trumpet played on the wrong side offstage, is hard to see). This evening is remembered not for how good the play was, but for the play's balm of simple human sweetness.

The Inevitable "Mikado" Department. – It looks as though the sturdy little "Pins and Needles" revue will be known some day as "Labor's Irish Rose," from the way it is now charging through its second year. Some of the numbers have been revamped, a few dropped, a few added; but outside of the fact that it has no excuse to be in such need of cutting still, the main thing that struck me in this year's visit was a new sketch called "The Red Mikado." It is worth seeing the whole show again for, and falls about midway in the second act (10:15 should be time enough). They have worked up three or four of the songs, solos and choruses, and interpolated everything but the kitchen sink, making one of the merriest sketches ever seen—and plenty of edge to boot. They poke fun at the other companies and threaten a Minsky "Strip Mikado" and when everything is beginning to jump they bring out Gilbert and Sullivan walking in their shrouds to demand what the hell goes on here. It's terrific

The Bandwagon

I do not know the numbers of anti-Stalinists executed in Loyalist Spain. I could describe scores of cases, but I shall confine myself to one because the victim may still be alive. – *"Stalin's Hand in Spain," by W. G. Krivitsky, in The Saturday Evening Post.*

Educators, he declared, had not provided "ideological allergy tests" to dispel many of the current "illusions." These "illusions" were listed by Mr. Jones as equality, democracy, security, collective bargaining and economic planning. – *A speech by Mark Jones, president of the Akron Belting Company, reported in The New York Times.*

Pastor Friedrich Mueller, leader of the opposition church, together with two other pastors is to appear in court on a charge of "misusing the pulpit."

The charge follows Pastor Mueller's request to his parishioners last September 30 to "pray for the maintenance of peace and a successful issue of the international efforts in behalf of peace." For this action the pastor's salary was stopped. – *News item in The New York Times.*

Charity Should Begin at Home

Italians . . . gave a new demonstration of their benevolence by opening the movie houses in Tirana [Albania] free of charge.

The natives were shown Italian propaganda films. – *A. P. dispatch printed in The Greensboro, N. C., Record.*

Watch the Words Go By

A theory that a stomach ache may be more responsible for a violent labor disturbance than a political conviction or economic consideration was advanced Saturday before 600 physicians and surgeons attending a two-day clinical program at Henry Ford Hospital. – *An item in The Detroit Free Press.*

Add Horrors of War

Scores of flirtatious couples were fined 11 lire, 10 centimes (about 60 cents), yesterday in Rome for immoral conduct during a "black-out' of the city during night air-raid maneuvers. Police seized many of the couples on buses. – *The (Bronx) Home News.*

I've-Got-a-Book Department

Six of the Ambassador's [Joseph P. Kennedy's] nine children toured Rome's historic ruins today in a bright red sight-seeing bus reserved for them. In the party were Eunice, Rosemary, Patricia, Bobby, Jean and Teddy. Kathleen, the eldest daughter, had seen Rome once before, so she stayed in a hotel with her mother. – *A. P. dispatch to The New York Herald Tribune.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column and $1 will be paid for each item used. Address The Band-

LICENSED TO UMI BY PROQUEST
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

World Federal Union

SIR: I have just read John Chamberlain's review of "Union Now" in the March 29 issue of The New Republic. It is the most intelligent analysis of its proposal and of the total situation that I have seen to date. He has pointed to important obstacles that must be met head on and overcome. No movement for world government can reach its objective if its eyes are closed to the forces and the barriers that stand in its way.

You point to one obstacle, however, that may, when we reach it, reveal itself as a mirage. I refer to the vested interests of the English automobile manufacturer, as well as those of the French peasant. The real fear of the bombing plane adds an important new factor to both these situations. When the danger exists that factories and machinery in one case, and lives in the other, are subject to swift destruction from the air, then the risks of union may seem less than the certain calamity of war.

That the "class war" will continue to rage after a World Federal Union is set up, I have no doubt. We can hope that the economic opportunities of capitalism in an expanding phase would soften the conflict, spread the inevitable changes in the controls of the means of production over a longer time and thus, possibly, even avoid altogether a violent revolutionary change.

A World Federal Union would have set up international political machinery for orderly, lawful social change. A democratic Union Assembly would be a forum within which that change could be worked out peacefully. But even if the ultimate economic conflict is in the end unavoidable, perhaps it would be better for it to be done within and for the whole, once and for all time.

As Streit insists, however, his proposal is neither a blueprint nor a cure-all. As you also point out, his great contribution has been to precipitate an age-old dream into the arena of intelligent popular discussion. A dream of perfection surely, but the common man needs dreams as well as bread by which to live.

WILLIAM P. BLAKE
For the Committee of Correspondence
for World Federal Union

New York City

For the Refugees

SIR: May I call the attention of your readers to the following communication I have just received from Paris:

The situation of the refugees from Spain and Czecho-Slovakia who are now in large camps in France is appalling. The majority possess just the clothes they stand up in, and these are already threadbare and entirely insufficient. Clothing of all kinds, for men, women and children, especially warm underclothing, overcoats, suits, pullovers, boots, etc., has to be collected as quickly as possible or these unfortunate people will die of cold. Already epidemics are frequent and the hardships through which these refugees have passed have so weakened their physical resistance that many die of exposure and illness.

We are making an appeal to the organizations and persons in the United States to help us to save the lives of these suffering people. All packages of clothing should be sent direct to us. We should be very grateful if you could help us in this affair.

(Signed) PAUL PERRIN
International Bureau for Right of

Packages of clothing should be sent by parcel post direct to M. Perrin at the above address. In addition to being Secretary of the Bureau, M. Perrin is president of the Consultative Commission of the Department of Interior and president of the Officers' Federation of the Reserve Republicans.

LUCILLE B. MILNER
New York City

Author Bites Critic

SIR: Looking a gift horse in the mouth is thought to be highly impolite, if not most unkind. As a humble and obscure poet it does not behoove me, therefore, to be critical of the brief notice which you permitted Muriel Rukeyser to make of my book in the March 8 issue of your very intellectual paper.

But somehow I feel compelled to lift my faint and obscure voice against inaccuracies of reporting and quotation. I am duly awed by Miss Rukeyser's capacity to strain for the flip phrase that will reflect her self-conscious command of adjectives and so give zest to her reviews.

As a poet, however, she ought at least to quote her fellow stragglers—wiry and insufficient though they are—correctly and to report (not, of course, review) the contents of their books accurately. The line "rustle of reason through waste" occurs nowhere in the volume; it appears to be a little note of a poem of her own. It is nice, of course, but not mine. And she reports that the book contains a poem (or a note for a poem, to be sure) about "a ship that cannot land." That, too, is nice, but unfortunately it's not my poem, for there is nothing in the volume that even remotely suggests such an idea. Maybe it's a note for a poem that she is planning?

HERBERT BRUNCKEN
Milwaukee, Wis.

Dewey as Political Philosopher

SIR: In his criticism of the "mildness, ineptness and commonplaces" of John Dewey's political pronouncements, Mr. Mark Stone (in The New Republic of April 12) follows the ever popular technique of assuming a position of superior knowledge from which *ex-cathedra* insinuations roll down majestically. For example, Mr. Stone smiles patronizingly at Dewey's "lukewarm attitude during the World War; his vote for Al Smith"; his interest in a third party; his "innocent defense" of Trotsky. Again, he raises lofty eyebrows at Dewey's "espousal of a dated, middle-class liberalism, and the naïve notion that our turbulent society will have successful issue when impregnated with the methods of science and technology."

Mr. Stone's criticism of Dewey seems such an emancipated thing. One doesn't have to deal with grubby and scrabbly affairs like Al Smith, or Trotsky, or a third party, or actually saying what one believes during a war. Instead, one can pontificate about "the soil of American society" and "the furrows of political life." Why worry about actual problems when there is always a logic of general notions to fall back upon?

Despite his admitted knowledge of Dewey's philosophy, Mr. Stone betrays himself. For experimentalism has no traffic with "soil," or "furrows," or a liberalism that can be formularized. It is the specific handling of specific problems that is demanded by the instrumental approach, not some mystical reference to agricultural figures of speech. Above all, Dewey's approach is not afraid to make mistakes: no experimental approach is. Dewey

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ruthie and Winfield, is a distinct and living person. And the story is living too—it has the force of the headlong anger that drives ahead from the first chapter to the last, as if the whole six hundred pages were written without stopping. The author and the reader are swept along together. I can't agree with those critics who say that "The Grapes of Wrath" is the greatest novel of the last ten years; for example, it doesn't rank with the best of Hemingway or Dos Passos. But it belongs very high in the category of the great angry books like "Uncle Tom's Cabin" that have roused a people to fight against intolerable wrongs.

MALCOLM COWLEY

Mr. Bingham's Program

Man's Estate: Adventures in Economic Discovery, by Alfred Bingham. New York: W. W. Norton and Company. 480 pages. $3.

SEVERAL YEARS AGO George Soule defended what was then his latest book, "A Planned Society," against the attacks of a fledgling "revolutionist" by saying: "To an economist writing a hundred years from now—though not to a social historian—all the present-day arrows will seem pointed in the same direction, whether they are radical Russian, fascist Italian or reformist American. They all are compelled to try to plan—with different purposes, of course. It may be true, as you say, that capital can't plan. But the proper procedure is to tell it what it ought to do. Then, if it fails, you have at least learned something from the failure." Since my quotation is from memory, I may be doing Mr. Soule an injustice through an incorrect shading of his language. But no matter how the remark was phrased, the content has stayed with me for six years. During the brief period when I was bemused by the intellectual finality of the closed system of Marxism ("a place for everything and everything in its place") the remark bedeviled me; later, it seemed extraordinarily wise.

But Mr. Soule should long ago have documented his wisdom by writing a book completely devoted to the comparative economics of the Soviet Union, Germany, Sweden, New Zealand, New Deal America, etc. His failure to do so has left some of his bewildered followers exposed for too long a period to a cross-fire from both Left and Right. It has remained for a colleague-competitor, Alfred Bingham of Common Sense, to write the legitimate sequel to "A Planned Society" in a tough, sometimes gnarled, book called "Man's Estate: Adventures in Economic Discovery." Mr. Bingham is one of those writers whom the Trotskyite editors of The New International seem willfully to misunderstand: a *political* writer who is not a *politician*. (In other words, Mr. Bingham writes to discover the truth, not to sell a bill of goods.) Possessed of a complete integrity, Mr. Bingham has cast his book in semi-autobiographical form: he insists on displaying all his prejudices, predilections and childhood "conditioning" so that the reader will be able to judge for himself just where subjective considerations mar the attempt at "objectivity."

Personally, I think Mr. Bingham is as objective as they come—although a strict economic determinist would be "intervene" [illegible]

ture that produced him. Autobiographical excursions to one side, "Man's Estate" consists of four parts. The first is a study of comparative economic anatomy in which Mr. Bingham investigates the Fascist dictatorships, the Soviet Union, the democratic economies, the "authoritarian" states of Japan, Turkey, Mexico, Brazil, Portugal and so on. The second part is a searching critique of Marxist economics (the best, in fact, that it has been my privilege to see). Part three is a "theory to explain the facts," and part four, the conclusion, consists of recommendations, both broad-scale and minute.

Since Mr. Bingham's own program rests on a rejection of the Marxism that once tempted him, let us dispose of his critique of "Das Kapital" first. Briefly, he thinks the labor theory of value, from which Marx derived the notion of surplus value, to be false: it cannot account for such elementary things as the fact that it takes more labor-hours to grow wheat in the Dust Bowl than it does to grow the same amount of wheat in eastern Kansas. Marxists do, of course, beg the question by introducing the concept of "abstract labor," of "generalized labor" and "a mere jelly of undifferentiated human labor." But you cannot measure with a "jelly." And as for that other question-begging Marxist phrase, "socially necessary labor time," that leads us back by a circuitous route to the concept of "marginal utility" which Marxists reject as an explanation of how economic value is determined. Inasmuch as no one knows what is "socially necessary" until human beings have made their choices in the market place (or, for that matter, in the Politburo) the social necessity of labor time cannot be determined until *consumer choice* comes into play. The labor theory of value thus turns out to be a variant of the marginal-utility—or consumer-preference—theory of value; and the whole foundation of Marxist economics (not of Marxist politics, which is something that can stand by itself) thus crumbles into dust.

Having disposed of Marxist economics, Mr. Bingham turns to the going concern of the Soviet Union. He notes, here, that the Five-Year Planners had to revive the "capitalist" mechanism of the "market" in order to sidestep chaos: overall planning from the top simply won't work unless society is to adopt a clumsy rationing scheme for all goods. The Soviet government does, of course, plan the production of the big things: steel plants, dams, coal, etc. But the consumer, armed with money, "plans" the consumer-goods schedule for the following year by the choices he makes this year. The Russians issue enough money to cover production of all types of goods, both capital and consumption, but to prevent inflation they tax or "borrow" back the money issued to pay for construction. The concept of "profit" is maintained as a bookkeeper device to promote efficient management.

Now there is nothing surprising in all this: the application of common sense must lead Marxists back to a "price" system. But what is surprising is that Fascist and democratic countries are all doing things in a way that is markedly similar to the Soviet way. The Fascists issue enough money to cover total production and then tax their kept capitalists or force them to buy bonds to cover future investment in capital goods. As for the democratic countries they do not

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

government takes up the slack in investment, and in the United States all factions, Left, Right and Center, are now yelling for a revival in the capital-goods industries. Whether by Left hook or by Right crook, we are going to get that revival eventually.

Inasmuch as all countries are in the grip of the same forces, and inasmuch as "revolution" ends up with a restoration of the "market," Mr. Bingham wonders why the necessity for an armed overthrow of the "capitalist" system. If monopolies and oligopolies can be forced to "administer" their prices at a point that is calculated to maximize production, and if the government can provide investment capital in slack times, the trick of transition to a stable but still progressive economic system might be accomplished without disturbing a single tag of "ownership." It is at this point, of course, that Marxists come through with their horse laugh. They are willing to grant the point that governments can "invest"—as a sop to the unemployed. But as for "owners" permitting an "intelligent" administration of prices? What naïveté!

Well, given an "owner" State, the Marxists are right. But Mr. Bingham cannot see that the so-called capitalist State is irrevocably the "instrument" of any class. Nor can he see that any good is apt to result from the Marxist theory of the State. If labor, following Marx, tried to seize the State by force, an intolerable chaos would result. If the so-called "new" middle class of clerks, engineers, bureaucrats and service-trade functionaries tried to grab the power (with the help of a few capitalists bent on suicide) the result would most likely be fascism. But if labor and the new middle class act together as a new democratic political unit, it is not by any means certain that an "owner" State can persist even under democratic capitalism. In any event, those who prize democracy more than class success must hold to the hopes for a "new" New Deal, with government moving into the picture to force new investment and to keep prices at a point that will bring out the customers. Maybe Mr. Bingham is wrong; maybe the capitalists won't behave in the face of democratic pressure. But if Mr. Bingham is wrong, get ready for the storm cellar. For the United States isn't a country with a big Marxist proletariat; its ideals and habits are middle-class. And if the United States is going to have a dictator, that dictator will be of the fascist variety.

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

Original Sin

The Family Reunion, by T. S. Eliot. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 131 pages. $1.50.

"THE FAMILY REUNION" seems to me a better play than "Murder in the Cathedral," better integrated, less of a charade. This time the subordinate characters are real persons, fuller, more differentiated, more sympathetic; and the ideas behind the play are fused into the action and the characters; it is difficult (and this is as it should be) to divorce the theme or the moral from the play itself. It would be an easy play to ridicule—a hag-ridden hero who appears in a vague mess and disappears toward a vague solution—but such ridicule would be misplaced. Aristotle

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Aristotle this play is not dramatic. But Mr. Eliot has always been more interested in action, and in the correlative suffering, on the spiritual plane. His religious beliefs, as can be seen from such books as his notorious "After Strange Gods," have opposed him to "liberalism," to any basically utilitarian doctrine of progress. From one point of view, then, Mr. Eliot is a reactionary, but he is at the same time a corrective to the facile optimism of many Leftist writers. We may regret that he seems to put all his money on the religious conscience as distinct from practical morality, but at the same time we must recognize that he asserts certain truths (even if these are the truths of the Unknown God) which are now commonly neglected and whose neglect may in the long run sap the life from our utilitarian ethics:

> . . . the circle of our understanding
> Is a very restricted area
> Except for a limited number
> Of strictly practical purposes
> We do not know what we are doing.

Though the subject of his play is Original Sin, Mr. Eliot has embodied it in characters who on the surface plane also are involved in dramatically interesting relationships to each other (this set of characters in the same situation could in fact have been treated by Chekhov). There is a compromise here between naturalism and mysticism. The definite surface facts—the mother's birthday, the family house, the brothers' accidents, the hero's home-coming, the previous death of his wife, the death in the last scene of his mother—may be from Mr. Eliot's point of view merely incidental, but they act as girders to the play. Thus the hero, like Orestes, has apparently committed (or thinks he has committed) a murder; this murder is merely incidental to, or at most symptomatic of, a far more basic and less particularized sin which he has to expiate. The Eumenides who haunt him appear at first sight to be subjective phantoms but are discovered, to the hero's own belief, to be forces outside him. His expiation on the face of it seems to consist in leaving his home forever; this is in fact the outward and visible sign of a profound spiritual change. This change being still obscure, Mr. Eliot was of course right to stress the outward and visible signs. For this reason the play seems to me more suited to the stage than "Murder in the Cathedral."

The trouble with "Murder in the Cathedral" was that the essential conflict was between Becket and himself as represented by the Tempters; the murderers merely arrived out of a machine. In "The Family Reunion," the hero is again struggling with himself, but the conflict is made more palpable by the antipathies between various members of his own family—between the hero and his family in general or his mother in particular, between his mother and the aunt who had stolen her husband, between this aunt and the other aunts and uncles, between the dead father and the mother, between the inhibited young cousin Mary and the mother and aunts. These characters are not treated satirically; even the stupidest uncle is allowed a certain human feeling and an inkling of truth outside himself. The old mother, who in a sense has been a vampire to her son, yet compares favorably with the mother in Messrs. [illegible] Isherwood's "Ascent of F-6," who is almost a

Technically the verse of this play is most successful, though some people have accused it of not being verse at all. Mr. Eliot has quite rightly avoided inserting any hunks of obvious prose; no prose-plus-verse play in recent times has as yet managed to be homogeneous. He has therefore had to contrive a versification elastic enough to be incantatory at one moment and to represent the banalities of conversation at another. This is a very considerable achievement. He uses his favorite devices—hypnotic repetition, antithesis, paradox, the overrunning of sentences from line to line, the simple and sharp but yet mysterious use of imagery:

> . . . the sobbing in the chimney
> The evil in the dark closet?

And there are echoes from his previous poetry—"south in the winter," "You don't see them, but I see them" (the key line from the "Choephoroe" of Aeschylus). It is foolish to cavil at these echoes when they are so well integrated into the present piece. Thus the scene between Harry and his Aunt Agatha is a reminiscence of "Burnt Norton," but is a magnificent presentation of the world of unfulfilled choices:

> I was not there, you were not there, only our phantasms
> And what did not happen is as true as what did happen,
> O my dear and you walked through the little door
> And I ran to meet you in the rose garden.

Most of the characters speak at one time or another as if they were a chorus; this is one of the advantages of a poetic play. Further, Mr. Eliot here has not introduced any external chorus (a disrupting influence on the modern stage) but on occasions (with a certain irony?) he makes the four stupidest characters step out of their proper parts and speak a commentary in unison. I am not sure if this will succeed on the stage, but it is at least a hopeful experiment. It is probable, however, that this could have been dispensed with and that characters like Agatha could have been left to speak the commentary singly and still more or less in character.

Lastly, this is a very moving play both as a whole and in its passing pictures, its ironic comments, its pregnant understatements, its bursts into liturgy. Witness Mary's criticism of Henry:

> . . . you attach yourself to loathing
> As others do to loving; an infatuation
> That's wrong, a good that's misdirected.

Or Henry's comment on himself as a person that his family has conspired to invent. Or one of his first remarks on remeeting them after eight years: "You all look so withered and young." Or his mother's dying words: "The clock has stopped in the dark." Or the brilliant reminiscences of a neurotic childhood. Or Henry's indication of his apparently eccentric conduct:

> In a world of fugitives
> The person taking the opposite direction
> Will appear to run away.

Mr. Eliot's own poetry may appear to be taking the opposite direction, but the reader of this play cannot, I think, object to it, as he could to "The Waste Land," that it is essentially defeatist; it embodies a sincere belief and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Announcing

CONSUMERS UNION'S *new* MEDICAL SECTION

Starting with this month's issue, a new Medical Section will appear regularly each month in *Consumers Union Reports*. It will contain authoritative medical reports on foods, drugs and cosmetics; articles on medical news and questions of public health; and pertinent information on hygiene and health.

This new department will be published under the supervision of Dr. Harold Aaron, author of "Our Common Ailment" and Special Medical Adviser to Consumers Union, with the advice and assistance of the distinguished Medical Advisory Committee listed at the right.

The new department starts with reports on—

Headache Remedies

—of the type of Bromo-Seltzer, which may provide the relief they are taken for but may also lead to addiction and to serious disability.

Antiseptics

Another report, on antiseptics and mouthwashes, attempts to provide better information about these widely promoted products than that offered by advertising fantasy.

Medical Advisory Committee

DR. WALTER C. ALVAREZ
Professor of Medicine, University of Minnesota. Mayo Foundation; Head of Section, Division of Medicine, Mayo Clinic; Editor, "American Journal of Digestive Diseases."

DR. ANTON J. CARLSON
Chairman, Department of Physiology, University of Chicago; Past President, American Physiological Society; Author, "The Control of Hunger in Health and Disease."

DR. MARION B. SULZBERGER
Assistant Professor of Clinical Dermatology and Syphilology, New York Post-Graduate Medical School, Columbia University; Editor, "Journal of Investigative Dermatology."

MEN'S SHOES

Elsewhere in the magazine you will find a detailed report on men's shoes with ratings of 16 brands. Two $4 shoes top the list while five others ranging from $2.98 to $6.75 are considered poor values at the price.

GARDENING

Besides the fun in gardening, there are also excellent fresh vegetables and fine flowers to be had—provided you know which brands of seeds and fertilizers to buy, what kind of soil is best for what kind of vegetables, etc. This report gives you a few simple hints and some ratings of supplies.

FACE CREAMS and POWDERS

There's little difference in quality between various brands but an astonishing difference in cost—2800% in the case of the cheapest and most expensive brands of cold creams rated. 85 brands of creams and face powders are covered in these reports.

Just mail the coupon below to get this issue. The yearly subscription fee also entitles you—without extra charge—to the 1939 BUYING GUIDE, a 288-page handbook containing ratings of over 2000 products to be published in May.

To: CONSUMERS UNION of U. S. Inc.
17 Union Square W, New York, N. Y.

Send me CONSUMERS UNION REPORTS for one year and the 1939 BUYING GUIDE when it appears. I enclose $3. I agree to keep confidential all material sent to me which is so designated.

Name .....

Address .....

How Science Refutes Hitler's Racial Theories At Every Point

By HERBERT J. SELIGMANN

RACE AGAINST MAN

THIS book presents for the first time the anthropological, scientific and historical evidence to refute completely the totalitarian race theory. "The author is complete master of his subject."—*Saturday Review.*

Noted Anthropologists Commend It

DR. FRANZ BOAS, Professor Emeritus of Anthropology, Columbia University, has written the introduction to this important study. And ROBERT H. LOWIE of the Dept. of Anthropology, University of California, says: "His critique of the race concept is particularly timely. I consider his position on the crucial points in accord with modern scientific findings, very well put, and extremely opportune. $2.75

At All Bookstores.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS

2 West 45th Street, New York

WRITE, WIRE, OR TELEPHONE TO

New Republic Books
40 East 49th Street
New York City
Tel. ELd. 5-4000

FOR BOOKS OF ANY PUBLISHER TO BE SENT, POSTAGE FREE TO ADDRESSES IN THE U. S. A.

SEVENTH RUSSIAN SEMINAR AND TOWN HALL IN EUROPE

With DR. JEROME DAVIS, *Traveler—Lecturer*

And DR. GEO. M. DAY, *Occidental College*

Gain first-hand knowledge of social, economic, political conditions in the U. S. S. R. and nine other countries.

England, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Roumania, Hungary, Switzerland, France.
And options: Austria, Germany, or Italy

Sail from New York June 27

For reservations and further information write to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When the Bombs Come

Ordeal, by Nevil Shute. New York: William Morrow and Company. $2.50.

HERE IS A NOVEL whose value is to be judged not so much in literary terms as by what it reveals about the British mind. It goes some way towards explaining why the average Briton acquiesces in Mr. Chamberlain and his umbrella in a manner that would have been inconceivable in 1914. Then the tight little island, secure in its navy, talked confidently of ending the War inside three months. But the bomber has changed all that.

Mr. Shute starts off with an account of the disruption, to use a mild word, caused by the dropping of about a thousand well aimed bombs on an English coastal town. There is no warning, and there is no effective counter-attack, for the bombers operate from a height above the clouds, taking marvelously accurate sextant observations of the stars that enable them to get their position within a mile. Communications are cut off, sewers burst, the water supply is fickle, and for a while no news is obtainable. The reaction is expressed through the person of a young lawyer, Corbett—married and father of three children, one an infant—whose neighbor's wife is killed, who loses his best friend, a doctor operating in the hospital, who sees the house opposite his own blown down, and who cannot get milk for the baby. Back in 1914 Corbett would have enlisted; as it is he and thousands like him feel that their first duty is towards their own folk. When Southampton is stricken by cholera he and his family leave the shelter of a trench in their front garden to take to the water, since they are luckily in possession of a small and not very seaworthy yacht. They are not allowed to land on the Isle of Wight without a health certificate, and Corbett has to make an adventurous sail to the French seaport of Brest which somewhat inexplicably—since France is also represented as being at war—is a haven from bombing. From Brest, Corbett sends his wife and children to Canada, and then, and not till then, does he join up.

The story reads well, it is exciting, it is plausible and, if it seems to leave off in the middle, that is also a compliment to Mr. Shute's skill in imaginative veracity.

NORAH HOULT

After Newton

A History of Science, Technology and Philosophy in the Eighteenth Century, by A. Wolf. New York: The Macmillan Company. 814 pages. $8.

THIS IS THE SECOND in the series of volumes which Professor A. Wolf of the University of London is projecting forward and backward in time until he covers the entire history of science and technology. Like its predecessor, which dealt with the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the book is a testimonial to the encyclopedic knowledge of the author. It traces the history of science in terms of the development of scientific ideas, and the interaction of these ideas with the practical problems of society. This fruitful

The eighteenth century is an epoch that the historians of science have neglected in favor of its more brilliant forerunner. Professor Wolf tells what it inherited from the "Age of Genius," and how this flowered in the "Age of Enlightenment." Newtonian principles and methods were gradually extended to every field of intellectual endeavor, with the result that advances in knowledge were made almost everywhere. Quite naturally, therefore, Professor Wolf pays greatest attention to the physical sciences and their technological applications, since they were the model for all the others. He describes how the seminal ideas of Newton were elaborated by such disciples as Lagrange and Laplace, and how their impact transformed chemistry and influenced medicine and the biological and social sciences.

Perhaps the most decisive influence of science during this century was the application to industry of scientific discovery. Technological innovations in agriculture, textiles, building and transport, power and machinery, mining and metallurgy are described with a wealth of detail, so that we are given fresh insights into the industrial revolution. Of particular interest is Professor Wolf's discussion of scientific instruments and the role they played in corroborating new theories and pointing the way to new discoveries. Despite the enormous scope of the work, it is written with an ease that makes its information available to layman as well as specialist. Every student of science will find it a mine of invaluable information. DAVID RAMSEY

New Books: A Reader's List

SHOWDOWN IN VIENNA, by Martin Fuchs (Putnam's, $3). A record of the conversations, protocols, treaties, pledges, first, second and third-hand remarks by Europe's statesmen about what was going to happen to Austria, from the end of 1935 until the thing happened. The sordid story is told in minute detail. Specialists will find it useful; it's a little verbose for the general reader.

I WANTED TO BE AN ACTRESS, by Katharine Cornell (Random House, $3). Ruth Woodbury Sedgwick asked Katharine Cornell if she would talk about what she has been doing since 1916. Miss Cornell says she has merely been working, acting in plays. As simple as that, and as characteristic of this fine artist and grand person. If you're interested in plays you must read the book; but half of it is an appendix, containing reviews of Miss Cornell's plays.

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A GERMAN REBEL, by Toni Sender (Vanguard, $3). A former member of the Reichstag describes her life in Germany from the war period—when she conducted anti-war agitation—to the day she escaped Hitler by jumping the Czech border. A plain, matter-of-fact journal without literary pretensions.

MY DAYS OF STRENGTH, by Anne Walter Fearn (Harpers, $3). Mrs. Fearn began her career as a physician in China forty years ago, when women physicians and Americans in China needed all the courage and social skill she inherited from a heroic Southern family. Her story is one of slowly won friendship and trust; her record of outstanding value in the promotion of international understanding and good will.

THERE IS NO RETURN, by Philip Jordan (Harpers, $3). The personal travel diary of the diplomatic correspondent

HOLT. HOLT. HOLT. HOLT. HOLT. HOLT. HOLT. HOLT. HOLT. HOLT. HOLT. HOLT. HOLT. HG

"Will revive old Gorki enthusiasms, and kindle fresh ones." —SATURDAY REVIEW.

A BOOK OF SHORT STORIES *by*

MAXIM GORKI

A collection of fifteen masterpieces, of which six have never before appeared in English.

The first adequate collection of Gorki stories ever published, nearly all retranslated to include the author's revisions. Foreword by Aldous Huxley. Edited by AVRAHM YARMOLINSKY and BARONESS MOURA BUDBERG. 403 pages, $3.00

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY, N. Y. C.

HOLT. HOLT. HOLT. HOLT. HOLT. HOLT. HOLT. HOLT. HOLT. HOLT. HOLT. HOLT. HOLT. HG

Reception Dinner ***to honor***

JULIO ALVAREZ DEL VAYO

Foreign Minister of the Spanish Republican Government

Chairman: **SHERWOOD EDDY**
Guest Speakers: **THOMAS MANN**
HENDRIK WILLEM VAN LOON

HOTEL ASTOR

Thursday, May Fourth, at 7 P.M.
Reservations $2.50 per plate

Auspices:

SPANISH REFUGEE RELIEF CAMPAIGN
381 Fourth Ave., N. Y. C. Tel. MU 4-5300

NR 3

ALVAREZ DEL VAYO, Reception Dinner
381 Fourth Avenue, New York City

Please reserve ..... plates at the May 4th dinner.
Enclosed find my check for $.....

Name .....
Address .....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ion he describes furious airplane trips all over the map, two spells with the Spanish Loyalists and interviews in Washington with everybody from President Roosevelt to Dorothy Thompson.

PAGES FROM A WORKER'S LIFE, by William Z. Foster (International, $2.50). The chairman of the Communist Party of the United States in a reminiscent vein about his fifty years as worker, labor leader and revolutionary. A simply written, penetrating story that epitomizes the hopes and illusions, the struggles and exploitation of the American working class.

OUR FAMILY, by Adet and Anor Lin (John Day, $2). Introduction by Pearl Buck. The three daughters of Lin Yutang (ages sixteen, thirteen and eight) brush up on their English and pass on their impressions of New York, Europe and Shanghai. A series of pert essays, wide-eyed but not naïve, childish but not coy, and a refreshing commentary on the Chinese family.

THE MIDAS TOUCH, by Margaret Kennedy (Random House, $2.50). Miss Kennedy's props include a shady mind reader, an international financier, two unhappy marriages, three budding love affairs and a mysterious, dark-eyed stranger. There's material for five novels here, all combined in one smooth, delightful plot. In the way of entertainment, there's everything a reader could want.

DOWN-EAST DUCHESS, by Ruth Blodgett (Harcourt, Brace, $2.50). About a woman whose idea of a good time makes a New England town fold its thin lips in dismay and whisper darkly behind closed shutters—but wonder privately if she hasn't got something after all.

HOME AT LAST, by Ernst Harthern, translated by Kenneth C. Kaufman (Bobbs-Merrill, $2.50). Home here is Palestine, which serves as haven for Jewish and fractionally Jewish refugees. Mr. Harthern dips into their problems—and there are plenty—with sincerity and affection. But because of its solemn style, the book has more weight as a chronicle of the land than as a novel.

SPANISH PRISONER, by Peter Elstob (Carrick and Evans, $2.50). A story of experiences in Barcelona prisons by a naïve young Englishman who went out to fight for the government in the hope of meeting "adventure and excitement." What he *did* meet makes pretty grim reading, since he was thrown into jail at once as a spy.

Contributors

HAROLD J. LASKI, the distinguished British political scientist, has spent this year in the United States lecturing at various colleges. His "Parliamentary Government in England" was published last fall.

GALLICUS is the pseudonym of a French political journalist.

EDMUND WILSON is at work on a study of the modern conception of history, called "To the Finland Station," sections of which have appeared in The New Republic.

MARGUERITE ARNOLD spent fifteen months in Istanbul. She has been a teacher, done editorial and public-relations work, and is now writing syndicated and magazine articles.

CONRAD PENDLETON was born on Kickinghorse Flat in Oregon and has worked most of his life as a cowhand, sheep-herder or store clerk. He is writing a novel about Oregon soil and its people.

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN, formerly the daily book reviewer for The New York Times, is an editor of Fortune. He will contribute a weekly book review to The New Republic beginning about June 1.

LOUIS MACNEICE is the author of "Poems" and, with W. H. Auden, "Letters from Iceland." His most recent book is "Modern Poetry: A Personal Essay."

NORA HOULT, the Anglo-Irish novelist, is the author of "Poor Women," "Closing Hour" and "Coming from the Fair," among other books.

DAVID RAMSEY, a contributing editor of Science and Society, writes articles on science for various periodicals.

"ONE OF THE GLORIES OF THE NATIONAL DRAMA."
—*Richard Watts, Jr., Herald Tribune*

RAYMOND MASSEY in
ABE LINCOLN IN ILLINOIS
By ROBERT E. SHERWOOD
PLYMOUTH Thea. W. 45 St. Eves. 8:35. Mats. Wed & Sat. 2:30.

THE MIDTOWN FORUM *announces*
VILHJALMUR STEFANSSON
on
"Soviet Science and Exploration in the Arctic"
SUNDAY, April 30th, 7:30 P. M.
GERMANIA HALL, 144 East 16th Street (Corner of Third Avenue)
Chairman: ROCKWELL KENT, President United American Artists
ADMISSION FREE

EUROPE • MEXICO
SOVIET UNION
Mexico 6 weeks $395—Cycling in Europe, 9 weeks $398—Europe and the Soviet Union, 7 weeks $498 — 14,000 miles through Scandinavia, Soviet Union, Turkey, Greece, etc., 9 weeks $698.
Steamship passage third class.
Send for 64-page catalogue describing these and 20 other unusual summer vacations.
THE OPEN ROAD
Room 1210
8 West 40th St., New York
Cooperating in the Soviet Union with Intourist

LECTURE

PROF. SCOTT NEARING, speaks on: "WHY DO CIVILIZED NATIONS MAKE WAR?" on: Tues. Eve., May 2nd, at 8:45 P. M., at 2 West 86th Street. Refreshments. Social Hour. Adm. 50c. The Group Forum.

RESORTS

ROCKY RIDGE "DUDE" RANCH
Lake Luzerne, N. Y.
$20 weekly, includes board, room, canoes, tennis, badminton, ping pong, bicycles, rifle range, etc. Restricted. Booklet.

WEARING APPAREL

WHY PAY FOR SNOOTY LABELS? For expensive clothes, hats, at moderate prices shop Miss Goodman, 474 Seventh Avenue. LA 4-4013.

LANGUAGES

BARGAIN PHONOGRAPH COURSES. We sell, rent, purchase, exchange. All makes, 20 different sets in French alone. Mail orders. Request Booklet R. LANGUAGE SERVICE, 507 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C.

CORRESPONDENCE CLUB

HAPPINESS CIRCLE, the best anodyne for the lack of camaraderie. Enclose stamped envelope for details

SUMMER RENTALS

ATTRACTIVE, 6-room cottage, 2 baths, all improvements; children's progressive camp and adult sport activities on premises. Stonybrook Manor, Westport, Conn. Tel. DEfender 3-7615.

PEEKSKILL VICINITY: 2 new bungalows, 4 rooms, bath, porch, furnished. Interior, knotted pine. On private estate, swimming pool. Dr. L. Landman, REgent 4-4022.

COUNTRY HOUSE furnished, overlooking lake, Westchester County; 6 rooms, large sun-porch, large sleeping porch, automatic heat. $600 annually. Telephone: Weekends, South Salem 148 and weekdays CH 3-5152.

TRAVEL

GUATEMALA—Private Group, interested in Mayan culture, sailing July. Several reservations available. Address: Box 144, The New Republic.

PERSONAL

YOUNG MAN, New Yorker, 27, seeks interesting feminine correspondence. Address: Box 143, The New Republic.

POSITION WANTED

ATTRACTIVE RECEPTIONIST, secretary, no shorthand but dictaphone; good correspondent; drives car;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED